



D U K E
U N I V E R S I T Y
L I B R A R Y

Treasure Room



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
Duke University Libraries

<http://www.archive.org/details/utopianway00veib>

THE UTOPIAN WAY

— — — *By* — — —
JOHN VEIBY
— — —

1917

SOUTH BEND
IND.

Copyrighted, 1917
By
JOHN VEIBY
All Rights Reserved

UTOPIA
RBR
14264

CONTENTS

BOOK I.

Opening Paragraphs.

A King's Court.....	7
The Impossible	8
The Program	10
Kings and Shepherds.....	16
Units	19
The Heritage and the Heirs.....	27
Standpatters	29

Utopias.

The Three Kinds.....	31
Instructive Utopias	31
Intelligent Utopias	35
Composite Utopias	45
The Cornerstone	49
Extension	51
Preservation	53
The Hut	54
A Lover's Lane.....	56
Marriage	57
The Saloon	59
Names and Titles.....	62
Remarks	64
Movements	66

Our Religion.

The Spirit of Prophecy.....	68
Our Temple	73
Observances	78
Rites and Rituals.....	80
Utopian Ritual Baptism.....	82
The Holy Communion.....	90

BOOK II.

Idle Thoughts.

The Shining Surface.....	95
Parasites	100
Population	104
Love Affairs	108
Motherhood	116
Fatherhood	116
Brotherhood	118
Sisterhood	125
Ideals	127
Gods and Heavens.....	132
Fairyland	133
Polytheism	134
Monotheism	135
Public Opinion	138
Reflections	139
The Pearl of Great Price.....	144
At Sea	150
Our Policies	159
Resurrection of the Gods.....	164
My Empire	168
Return of the Father.....	169

BOOK III.

Christ and His Kingdom.

Foreword	176
Moses	176
The Promised Land.....	179
The Prophets	180
The Messiah	182
The Gospel According to Utopians.....	184
The Kingdom	185
Christianity	194
The Power That Be.....	200
Our Kingdom	207
Second Coming of Christ.....	209
The Many Mansions.....	212

BOOK I.

THE CLOUDS

Thoughts on Utopias or Ideal Common-
wealths as Means Towards Social
Adjustments.

OPENING PARAGRAPHS

A KING'S COURT



NCE upon a time a Nature Faker, so-called, told a beautiful story about a child that was lost in the wilderness, and how a wolf followed that child in mute admiration.

This story ought to be true. When a human child has lost its way, not only wolves, but other animals as well, should pay it homage. And every rattlesnake in its path should hide its poisonous head in the moss while the little one was passing, and rattle its tail to the child's amusement,

But will they do it?

It is the experience of our race that they will not.

To keep the wolf from the door was the problem before we had houses. It is the problem now, long after the original wolf is almost extinct. For there are wolves and wolves.

By kindling a fire primitive men kept the animals at bay. In the light and glare of the fireplace, the gentler creature, man, found protection from the growling beasts, and this gathering, the family, constituted the first utopia or ideal commonwealth.

In time this gathering around the hearthstone proved too small for man's needs, and an altar was then made the center of a larger community, and within the charmed circle thus created gentler men and gentler arts could flourish.

Now, when the fires on the altars grow pale in the light of a new day and wolves in sheep's clothing are hiding in holy places, new means must be found to overcome the adversaries of gentler, yet stronger and fairer, specimens of humanity, created for themselves by a superior insight or cunning. Otherwise they are lost.

We are sorely pressed by shepherds of every kind and description. They love us too much. We are killed by their love. They want us to succeed their way. But their way is our destruction. Their watchful eyes are ever upon us. At work we must keep at it everlasting, otherwise we shall not succeed. To look at the clock spells failure. In any line of endeavor, to slack up only for a minute is fatal, for in that one minute, so we are told, someone else shall get ahead of us. Above all we must be careful and not waste a leisure moment during a brief vacation, but read, study and try in every conceivable way to enlarge our mind to

get a greater outlook. It is all so true, so depressingly true. Try as we may to avoid them, our saviors and protectors are always after us. And, as the law drove St. Paul to accept Christ as his only salvation, so our shepherds shall compel us to create a king's court for our own safety.

Safety from *our* enemies; freedom, but not freedom from dangers. Let it be like a consuming fire. Attracted by its light many shall perish, while others, to their own surprise, shall here find a new heaven.

Lest the unfortunate souls who cannot endure the trials of freedom shall say that they were lured to their destruction, it would be well to write over the portals of utopias, as a warning, the words a poet inscribed over the gates of Hell:

"Abandon all hope, ye who enter here!"

From the start utopias must be the abode of lost souls, that is, lost to older social ideals. If a Jew, for example, enter, to the extent he is Jew, his presence is detrimental, perhaps fatal to its success. On the contrary a lost Jew, one freed from the fixed ideas of his race and his religion, should be a great acquisition. So also a lost Christian shall be welcome to our court. Being now immune to the ideas of original sin and the wonderful salvation by faith and blood, his presence shall be a source of strength.

As particularly fitted we shall mention little children. They, as yet, are not found, and not being found equals, being lost. We are all born innocent, and so long as we are children we remain innocent and as such are acceptable.

The original sin is inculcated in the minds of the young by shepherds. In baptism the evil spirit is breathed into the faces of babies, and Protestants vie with Catholics in creating the faith that we by nature are damned. There is no question about it. But, to the extent that this faith has hold upon us, we are damned already and a poor material for an ideal commonwealth.

For sundry reasons, that later shall become apparent, it is also desirable that the old, the sick and the destitute shall be gathered into our utopias regardless of their faith.

Though their faith be opposed to the principle of an utopia, they are now, in their condition, too feeble to seriously interfere with its policies.

THE IMPOSSIBLE

They who pray, "Thy Kingdom Come!" pray without faith, and, if anybody else proposes an ideal commonwealth where there shall be no sorrow nor crying any more, he is invariably met with

the objection, "Why, this is utopian." The implication is that something impossible is contemplated.

Lately, however, so many things have come to pass that only a short time ago were deemed impossible, that at last we shall come to believe that only standpatism is impossible.

When we look at the stars, does it not seem impossible to measure the distance between them and find out their size and substance? And yet it is done. It was not done in a day, but that only adds to the wonder. The wonder that throughout all the ages of turmoils and wars some men had time and the inclinations to study the sky until the firmament at last vanished for their gaze, and all of us now can look out into limitless space. Compared with this the creation of utopias seems a simple matter.

It is simplified, too, because we in a greater measure can profit by other experiments.

For earlier than our observations of the heavens was our attempts at utopias. Take the comparatively recent examples Sparta and Israel. What were they but attempts on the part of Lycurgus and Moses to create ideal commonwealths? The Kingdom of Heaven, the Gospel—what is it but a dream of utopias?

Anything that is not utopian shall not carry us very far.

The practical has its limitations. The inventor of the sewing machine, for example, could not make any great headway so long as his mind was set on the improvement of the needle. Freed from that fixed idea a new idea of doing the old work in another way could enter his mind, and the sewing machine that was nowhere came to be.

The main trouble with utopians heretofore seem to have been that they sought to make their utopias *one*. For my utopia may not be your utopia, and ours not that of a third, etc.; for this must be the first question in regard to any and all utopias proposed: What is there in it for me?

By making them many and *different* we shall avoid that stumbling block.

The social instinct is not explained so much by this that we are alike, as by the fact that we are different. This is most strikingly demonstrated by the natural association, the family, founded as it is on a difference in sex, and held together by differences in age and differences in needs that only others can supply. So one utopia shall be strengthened by the establishment of others different from it.

As a mutual need we shall mention a free exchange of members. For having only one social ideal makes it impossible for a great number of individuals to find a place where they feel at

home, and hence they are likely to become a menace. To facilitate this exchange of members, that for some reason may be detrimental to the welfare of one, but for the very same reason may constitute an element needed by another, is essential to the growth of utopias. Consequently it is poor policy to make the utopias closed systems wherein individuals are kept as in a prison.

Reformers with good reason sometimes complain about the lack of response on the part of the majority. But many of the reforms advocated are only prison reforms: better fare, shorter hours and more pay; stricter or more lenient rules and regulations, as the reformer sees it. While all these reforms may be needed, and may be very good in their way, we ought not to expect any great enthusiasm on the part of the prisoners in regard to them. But let one whisper into the ear of a single convict a word that shall tell him a way whereby he, and after him, others may escape. That word is dynamic.

Life is positive, waiting for an outlet, looking for an opening, waiting for a word of deliverance, and utopias shall stir the stagnant waters, and by giving the floating population an aim, convert it into a purifying stream.

Confined within communities as within closed shells that give little or no opportunity for movement and obstruct assimilation and elimination, the members constituting the same degenerate. Let us, therefore, create our utopias around a kernel of some sort, a King's Court, that shall give to its surroundings an atmosphere in which men can freely move, being held together by mutual attraction only. And though these courts be open like the air is open even to fishes, only those who are fitted for a particular court, shall be able to enter therein or endure its life for any length of time.

THE PROGRAM

If we shall go anywhere or do anything, we must start from where we are with what we have and with people such as we are. As promoters of utopias therefore let us go over the ground slowly and carefully. Study ourselves and the forces at our command as well as the strength and position of opposing parties. As we go we may be able to formulate a program for the creation of ideal commonwealths or utopias, and suggest a plan of campaign.

To begin with, this is our working theory:

We all want to do something but we don't want to work.

Already, or more especially, in children we observe this aversion to work, and this propensity to do something, generally speaking, to play.

Into these two classes, work and play, we shall divide all our activities and define work or labor as compulsory exertion or doing what we don't like, and play as voluntary exertion or doing what we like.

The nature of our exertions or the object of our endeavors does not matter. A disagreeable task like Hercules cleaning a stable may be executed as play, and many performances that to begin with were hard work a man may grow to like, and it is then play. On the contrary dancing and singing, these primary expressions of a playful spirit, may degenerate into work, and probably is hard labor for many performers on the stage.

A definition of utopia satisfactory to most people would be: Utopia is a community where we don't have to work. But as this only covers half the proposition, we shall add: And where we can do as we please.

For utopians it is needless to emphasize man's dislike of labor. But as this trait constitutes a strong argument in favor of utopia, and as the blessing of work is ever enlarged upon in the home, the school, the press, etc., a few words to the contrary are not amiss.

They who work—we are not talking of those who like it, they are playing—work in the hope that some time in the future they shall have saved enough to enable them to quit working. Or work in the hope that they shall be able to leave their children a sufficiently large sum safely invested, so their loved ones can live on the interest thereof; that is, be free from work.

As more desperate ways to avoid work we shall mention: To beg, to steal, to rob. But in this rush to avoid work let us not forget the gentlest and most effective means of all, unfortunately only possible for a minority, namely, to live on the interest of money safely invested.

A beggar must exert himself to some extent. A thief or a robber runs the risk of losing both life and reputation. But the safe investor takes no risk and remains a highly respected member of the community. To him belongs the palm of victory.

Far from deplored this tendency to avoid work, we, as stated before, rejoice in it as in a force carrying us onward to our goal. This will at once be clearly seen when we call attention to the fact that to avoid work is the underlying motive for the invention of labor-saving machinery, likewise for the introduction of more efficient management of business and manufacturing concerns. For an ideal commonwealth can properly be classed as a labor saving device. And if an idea of utopia or utopias should occur to us, an idea that appealed to people with common-sense as practical, as likely to secure them leisure, luxury and a higher degree

of culture—further, that it was made clear that the introduction of utopias could be put on an experimental basis and the different ideas could be tried out without any great risk either to individuals or the community at large, their establishment would follow as a matter of course.

Invention of labor-saving machinery is in perfect accord with the instinctive manifestation of life. The object is the same, to perform functions or obtain certain ends with the least friction.

Instinctively this is accomplished by forming the organism itself to respond automatically to the sensations of pleasure and pain. But as the very act of living changes the living being and its needs as well as its surroundings, no perfect adjustment is possible. Of this the organisms are more or less painfully aware or conscious, and a readjustment is always in order, and life on that account goes on forever.

So also the aim of an inventor is to create a machine that shall work with the least friction, preferably automatically.

The power intelligence gives man to invent machinery frees him to some extent from the necessity of changing his body in conformity to changed conditions.

To overcome the painful sensation of cold, for example, we need not grow fur like a bear. The invention of fire, clothes and houses enable us to overcome that pain and we remain as we are. But here also we observe the effects of the same law even more emphasized, namely, that every new invention changes the conditions of our lives and calls for new ones to satisfy new desires. A readjustment is always in order, and there is no end to our labors.

Being aware of this fact, that inventions seem to give us more work, some advocate the simple life. Back to the farm, is the slogan; as if it were simpler to draw water from the well with an old oaken bucket than to turn a faucet in the sink, or easier to tend to a kerosene lamp than to illuminate the whole house by simply pressing an electric button.

But the dweller in the country, often more familiar with the advantages of machinery than the dweller in the cities, has no illusions on the subject of the simple life on the farm. He works hard and his toil is lightened only by the thought that some time he shall be able to go to the city and enjoy all its pleasures, incidentally the company of the advocate of the simple life generally there to be found.

Notwithstanding this, that we are well aware that the simple life on a farm had a charm all its own, a charm that the city has not, we cannot go back to a more primitive mode of life. Cannot because we will not. As utopians we may turn towards the country,

but first we must find a way to take all the advantages the cities offer with us. Until then, hypnotized by the cities as we are, perhaps we shall degenerate; but as we sink into the slums our eyes shall be looking and our hearts shall be longing for ease, for luxuries and a more abundant life.

Another labor-saving attempt is the division of the world's work. This, too, is an attempt to avoid the pain a change of occupation and habits gives us. And this tendency to create castes, is instinctive and always operative. We have the military and priest castes still with us, though shorn of some of their glory and power. We have a ruling class of business men, an official and a professional class, mechanics, and common laborers, all of these more or less hereditary.

Farmer boys are told to stay on the farm and follow their fathers' occupation or go back to the farm. Mechanics are told to stick to their trades. As to common laborer, praise takes the place of admonition. We speak patronizingly of horny-handed sons of toil and above all about *honest* working men. But we all feel this to be a praise of doubtful value. Also that it tends to bring honesty into disrepute, creating an impression that it is a sort of stupidity. To this order of thought belongs the old advice at times given even today: Be content with the place God has ordained for you.

Surely much can be said in favor of castes. Much friction and painful ambition would be done away with; and who could possibly be better farmers than the boys raised in the country? And would not the sons of mechanics be apt to inherit some of their fathers' skill, likewise officials and professionals their fathers' virtues? Our intelligence must approve of this instinctive attempt to make efficient servants all around.

It is nevertheless *not* utopian. For even if we succeeded in making the different classes capable and content, each fulfilling its function without friction, because mind and body in each case was perfectly adjusted to that function, it would not be an ideal commonwealth. The social body working without friction—that is, automatically—its members would sink to the level of animals. We would then be happy as animals, but would lose the self-consciousness born of pain and opposition. And without this consciousness what would our utopias be? Bereft of reason or without intelligence our commonwealth could not be ideal.

Often in our trouble we express a wish that we were as happy as the animals, but we do not mean it. Although it would free us from worry, from the memory of past mistakes and the anticipation of future trouble, we prefer the wide horizon given by intelligence to the narrow circle prescribed by instinct.

This does not exclude that we as utopians shall seek happiness; only that our conception of happiness does not consist in becoming at one with instinctive life, but in our ability to rise above it, and gain a deeper and more comprehensive consciousness of existence. But this implies a greater sensitiveness developed by friction, whereby we are made capable of ascending to higher heavens of ecstasy but whereby we also at times shall be plunged into the anguish of deeper hells.

Fortunately the specialization of labor beyond a certain point destroys its evil effect of forming our minds and our bodies to its performance. Our special line of business, our little rut of routine, our operation in a manufacturing concern or whatever our occupation may be, becomes at last too insignificant, too feeble, to impress itself on body and soul and loses its power and we are saved from sinking to the instinctive plane.

There is, for example, a growing army of men and women, a floating population, capable of going into the factories of various branches of industry and on short notice operating different machines or filling other positions satisfactorily. This detachment from the tools saves them from the stigmata of any single trade. And, though they in some respects are inferior to the specialist or expert, they are nevertheless nearer to an utopian ideal: To be master of all trades and the slave of none.

Doing away with work necessarily implies that we at the same time do away with a working class. As the great majority of the workers are poor and as a great deal is said about the idle rich, we must be on our guard and not identify the working class with the poor. According to our definition, there are perhaps proportionally just as many workers, hard workers at that, among the rich, that is, men occupied or tied up with business that they do not like but which they feel in duty bound to perform. On the other hand many day laborers like their work, and should not, according to our definition, be classed as workers.

The working class or working man, as above defined, is nothing but a tool, the first tool invented in order to get away from work. For the simplest way out of it was and is to let others do it.

The ability on the part of some to enslave others, be it by brute force or by an intelligent use of the subtle power of superstition, or by the gentle means of training and persuasion, ought not to be condemned. It is the beginning of civilization, a civilization as yet dependent on it. But we are not justified in upholding slavery of any kind beyond the time it can safely be discarded.

And it can be safely assumed that as a means to insure leisure to a few, even for those few at times it must be felt to be an un-

wieldly tool, and that its use has a brutalizing effect upon themselves, that it makes the heart, if not the hands, callous.

But rest as a permanent state is not heaven. When we are rested we grow restless and want to do something. This part of our working theory shall now be considered.

The accumulation of a surplus energy that normally follows a period of rest gives us pain until it has found an outlet. And the discharge of that surplus energy gives pleasure provided it is voluntary.

Of course what is compulsory and therefore painful to begin with, may, if we are strong enough, change into voluntary and therefore pleasurable activities.

In what line our activities shall be directed depends not alone on our character or natural inclinations or our surroundings, but to a great extent on this: Has this occupation been the general work of slaves? Any work, however, that is done voluntarily is by that act cleansed from the taint that thralldom gave it. Slavery itself is glorified if it is voluntary. It is then called devotion. Although we may doubt the wisdom of such devotion, we all admire those who sacrifice their lives for a cause, or surrender themselves to the will of God, provided it is done in utter sincerity. Why then should it be anything degrading in feeling the same toward a living person or in telling him or her: You can do as you please with me.

But it shall take us a long time before the blemishes that the use of the tool slavery gave us, shall be entirely eradicated from our character and give us a free choice to do what we really like to do.

To will makes us free. It does not matter what we do so long as we will it.

To run a saloon or a Sunday school or take active part in any institution, saves us from ennui, the painful sensation of not knowing what to do, and gives us pleasure in exact proportion to the interest we take in it.

But as we outgrow the Sunday school and take no interest in the saloon, so it may be in regard to many other things. They become matters of indifference to us. Then our soul is dead or rather it is dormant like the seed in the ground during the winter season, waiting for a new spring-time that shall awaken its will, and call forth its slumbering energies.

This change from *not* willing to *willing* is nothing but the old miracle of conversion or rebirth, and probably, like all births, a painful process, an act of despair. It is a leap in the dark—into a world of light, activity, expansion. And faith comes with doing,

a faith that moves mountains. Or rather, it gives us the wings that shall carry us thither to the Mount of Transfiguration.

KINGS AND SHEPHERDS

The industrial warfare calls for kings.

We cannot do very well without kings. Man by nature is a herding animal, and as such requires a leader of some sort, a headman or chief, or, as we prefer, a king. When the real king disappears we get substitutes of all kinds: Czars, Constitutional Monarchs, Popes, Bishops, and an innumerable brood of bosses, political, commercial, industrial.

What then are the real kings, the kings wanted for our utopias? So long is it now since they passed away that merely to form a correct idea of their character is no easy task, and to bring them into existence seems like an attempt to bring into existence an extinct race. Indeed, to get a true idea of a real king, we must go back to a prehistoric age when man was a herding animal and nothing more.

In that long ago the individual who forced himself to the front became the leader or king. Will, and ability to face all dangers and overcome all obstacles, to be foremost in all battles against animals and hostile tribes constituted the only title to kingship. And no one disputed a title obtained in this way, neither did any one doubt the necessity of having kings so long as the life of man was a continual warfare.

The king of that time had to be aggressive, and all his energies were directed outward. While he was the head and ahead of the others he nevertheless remained at one with his followers in will, in aspirations and general interests.

And by word and example he gave the herd courage and good cheer.

Peace, we shall assume, brought about a degeneration of kings. And in time of peace another leader, or rather driver, appeared—a rival and opponent to the king and his men, a perverted king who we shall name the *shepherd*.

The shepherd's will is directed inward; that is, toward the flock which he seeks to tame, to subdue, to civilize; in other words, to make obedient to his will or law.

To plant fear in the heart of the people, and through fear gain dominion over them, is his main concern. And the means employed to that end are principally the forces of superstition, the mysterious, the unknown.

With the shepherd *sin* came into this world, the torments of peace and the loathsome diseases of the fold.

"Show me a sinner in the world still if no one needs to do what suits a superior." Thus spake Max Stirner, and St. Paul expresses the same thought: "Where no law is, there is no transgression." This theory has been tested and found true: In Sparta there was no law against adultery—and in Sparta no adultery.

The king represents the liberating spirit: *I will*. And the shepherd the crushing: *Thou shalt*.

Under different names we always find these two opposing powers represented. Among the red Indians the chief and the medicine man; among the Egyptians the pharaoh and the magician.

Among us the shepherd element dominates. Of that element we have not only the priesthoods of the different Christian denominations, but also the Jewish rabbis and the high priests of ancient and modern cults. To these we can add most of the secret societies and benevolent associations. But this by no means includes the entire shepherd element. Most political parties, especially the prohibition party, are shepherdly in spirit. The Republic itself as a restraining and civilizing agency is a shepherd; the only shepherd, by the way, recognized by utopians.

The king element is most strikingly represented by members of the capitalistic class. Instinctively we speak of railroad kings, cattle kings, cotton kings, etc. If we have in mind that the function of the original king was to plan and execute a raid, and if successful, to divide the spoil with his followers, we find it easy to identify him with merchant princes, Napoleons of finance and captains of industry. They are kings, all right, but if I sit not in their council and above all, if I have no share in the dividends, they are not *my* kings. If we, as utopians, always insist on this point, we shall not be far amiss in our creations of real kings.

An incident in the life of Alexander throws light on the character of a true king and also reveals the fact that the king element of today is not up to the heroic standard, which necessarily must also be the utopian standard. It is told of him that one time he with his army crossed a desert, and that all of them suffered terribly from thirst. They tried to find water, and finally found just enough to fill a helmet. This they carried to their king. Did Alexander drink it? No. Alexander was great, Alexander was a hero. So he poured the water out in the sand because he would not fare better than his soldiers.

Did the captains of industry ever do anything like that? Did they ever starve themselves because they would not have a better time than the men working for them, when over-production set in, work was slack and people suffered from want of food? Not to my knowledge. No. The captains of industry may be great

and in many respects better than most people, but they are not heroes. Not yet.

Alexander wept because there were no more worlds to conquer. In this we know now that he was mistaken. There are ever new worlds to be discovered or created, and barriers to be broken, and a never-ending battle against the "Thou shalt not" set by shepherds. But his tears reveal that a true king seeks *glory*, not possessions.

The dream of empire is a shepherd's dream.

In the sporting world we shall find characters identical to those of the kings wanted in utopias. The creation of ideal commonwealths, by the way, should rightly be considered as a new sport, or as a revival of an old art. The original royal art is to create kingdoms. A social readjustment approached in that spirit would gain the benefit of the enthusiasm that naturally goes with all play, and the interest of outsiders also, who would be wondering how it would come out. It shall also free us from the spirit of fanaticism so easily aroused when the religious sides of social questions are foremost in our minds, and also the ugly spirit engendered when the economic side is given undue prominence.

Glory and the very joy of the play animate the leaders in the sporting world. Here we also get a clue to the selection of kings, and the relations between him and his men which must prevail in utopias: Must, because it is the ideal.

One intensely interested in baseball, football or any other game naturally looks for an opportunity to join a team. Failing in this, perhaps he decides to start one himself and then looks for players. Or there may be several interested in the game who then set about to find a captain.

So long as the play is the thing and no outside power interferes, no trouble is experienced in assigning to each player the part to which he is best fitted.

Titles not earned do not count in the sporting world, neither shall they do so in utopias; in this respect they are thoroughly democratic.

So, also, in the realm of art, ability is the only thing that counts. Imagine the roles in a grand opera played by the sons and daughters of great singers instead of by those naturally fitted for those parts, what kind of performance would that be?

When kingship became hereditary it was doomed. It was dead in the first generation.

The Spartans "perceived that their kings had only the outward appendages of royalty, but in nothing else differed from the mul-

titude; whereas Lycurgus had abilities from nature to guide the measures of government; and powers of persuasion, that drew the hearts of men to him."

And so it is always. The natural leader needs no artificial means to make his orders obeyed. Neither does he need to create an artificial distance between himself and his men in order to increase his authority. His authority is rather augmented by his freely associating with his people on terms of equality.

Kings wanted: This is opportunity now knocking at the door. This is what many a man, who wanted to do something, but did not know what to do, has been waiting for. Once more it shall be possible, as it was in a forgotten past, to choose kingship as a career.

UNITS

The unit of our Republic is the *Individual*. The individual is King. The King is one who *can*. And in our republic we can because we are free.

This is easy to say and easy to admit in an off hand way, but hard to realize. But few are able to grasp the full import of this idea. For our minds are dominated to a great extent by ideas and ideals of earlier attempts at civilization, where the individual was closely bound to family, tribe, gods, etc.

The right to own property, the right to assemble, the right to express our opinions, are individual rights. We are at liberty to found or join a family, a church, a fraternity, a corporation, but none of these creations can ever become a unit of our Republic. And no individual can be owned or held in bondage by any other man or body of men.

The Declaration of Independence reads: "We hold these truths to be selfevident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights; that among those are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

And we may search all scriptures, sacred and profane, we shall never find a principle formulated on which organized society can more securely rest.

It is in accordance with the natural order. Nowhere in nature do we find any special privileges bestowed upon any specie, or any favoritism shown by any class or individual. And while civilization and the institutions of civilization, including the Republic, is an imposition on the natural order by the human will made possible by intelligence; this will and intelligence and the civilization resulting,

is an outgrowth of the natural order, and we cannot, with impunity, violate the law governing all life. This law is growth; a tendency towards differentiation as a means to an endless readjustment.

If the republic of our own making shall endure, we must give individuals of the most various types an opportunity to have it their own way, and facilitate changes in customs or morals to meet the demand of individuals.

As social beings, we must, of course, modify our conduct so as to make association possible. This modified conduct in former days grew into customs or moral codes hard to break. In fact it was the chief concern of the famous law givers to make their codes unbreakable; that is, fixed and eternal. Opposed to this is the idea of democracy which demands that we shall change our laws to suit ourselves.

Although we hold that the Republic is the highest form of national organization, the highest because it was created to secure freedom for the individual, we are not blind to the fact that it must suffer from the defects inherent in all organizations. No sooner do we declare that we are born with equal rights ere we are reminded that we are no two of us born alike in other respects. We don't feel alike, let alone think alike, and our views differ. To lay down rules that shall suit everybody is as impossible for the majority that theoretically rules a Republic as it was for Kings and Gods or their Priests. And, of course, this letting a majority decide what laws shall be enacted or repealed is a violation of the principles of equality. It amounts to a special privilege of the majority, but again, of course, it rests with me, the individual, to influence this majority or the public opinion of which it is an expression, or in other ways make it act in conformity with my wishes. And by limiting the sphere of action, and thereby the power of the majority, as already done in regard to religion, so it can not interfere with a man's religious opinions, most of this defect is obliterated. And by limiting the power of majorities to decide what our morals or customs shall be, and to the same extent, expand the sphere of action of individuals, we shall come close to perfection.

A majority will surely agree that in matters properly within its sphere we rather trust a majority than any single individual, be he ever so great, or a minority though it be composed of the best people. As a matter of fact, republics compare favorably with monarchies, absolute or constitutional, and it can be truly said that nations today are great to the degree that they have adopted free constitutions.

A highly developed nervous system as it were, that enables every one to record his experience, and in a measure change the public mind and alter its policy in accordance with the widest experience, marks the superiority of democracy over all other forms of organized society.

The experience of one individual or a class of individuals is only partial, and to the extent it is partial it is defective. In aristocracies only a part of the social body is in touch with the social will by recording its sensations of pain and pleasure.

Now to cut the nerves from the lower limbs of the social body may temporarily save those who are more favorably situated from many painful sensations, but utterly ignoring these sensations must sooner or later prove disastrous.

The famous image which a King saw in his dream had a head of fine gold, breast of silver, belly of brass and legs of iron. But the feet were part of iron and part clay. Although this material of which the feet were made suggests re-enforced concrete it is in reality a poor material to stand upon, even for an image and it fell when an invisible stone coming from nowhere, hit its feet. For clay is not cement and human clay especially is apt to give away any time and unless the feet be looked after and the pressure relieved, our Iron Age shall come to an end.

We know from experience that it hurts us just as much to stub our toes as it does to bump our head. Yet favored classes always insist that the unfortunate are lacking in sensitiveness even at times insisting that these latter have no souls.

Where women are degraded and held as property it is also held that they have no souls. And anyone who has read the arguments will admit that it is just as easy to prove that woman has no soul as it is to prove that man really has one. Recently I read an able argument in favor of the theory that children have no souls in the proper sense of that word. An unconscious effort, perhaps, to justify child labor.

That woman in our republic has not the full franchise is a remnant of the morals of lower stages of civilization, and a reminder that we are unable as yet to live up to its principles.

The right to vote does not imply that it is our *duty* to vote on any or all questions. Rather, it must be our duty *not* to vote upon questions with which we are not familiar or for candidates of whom we do not know anything, and whose election does not concern us in the least.

Woman most likely would abstain from voting in many instances, but that does not invalidate her right, and her duty also, to

vote on questions vitally affecting herself, or on issues touching on phases of public life where she may have more experience and consequently more knowledge than man.

Equal rights for men and women does not mean that men and women ought to be occupied with the same work privately, or fill the same positions in public life, although they have the liberty to do so. There is some work more natural to women, and some tasks to which men are better adapted.

The hearthstone was the original center of all communities, and, generally speaking, the kitchen is woman's place. Man's place is in the field of action. The hearthstone or home to him is only a place of rest. But as the home circle widens so as to include the whole nation, woman's sphere, the kitchen, should expand with it, and it would help us greatly to form a true idea of our republic if woman were elected to fill all the offices and tend to the routine business. So long as men fill these positions and perform these functions it clings to them, and to us the idea and sentiment inherited from absolutism, that they are rulers not servants. And so long as that sentiment prevails few can realize that I, the individual, am King.

It is outside our immediate aim, and aim already indicated, namely to create utopias, but in passing let us for a moment consider the principles of democracy applied to the movement for universal peace.

We shall never have peace so long as we have the powers, that is, an oligarchy among nations, but only a dream of peace. It is the dream of the powers that be, as it is of absolutism, and as it was of the Roman Empire and the Roman Church. To subject all people to one power and by this subjugation bring about universal peace has been the aim of all the powers above mentioned, but this very aim necessarily brings about war and not peace.

Otherwise is the democratic idea applied to international affairs. It means that each nation regardless of its size or population shall have an equal vote both in the making of international laws, and in the deciding of cases brought before an international court.

This idea that each country shall have an equal say in world politics regardless of the size of territory and number of inhabitants, strikes one at first as unreasonable. So it seems unreasonable to many, even in countries where democracy is established, that the vote of a millionaire shall count no more than that of a common laborer. This, however, is the idea of democracy that it is the individual, in this case nations, that counts regardless of riches, religion or race.

If size gave no special privilege or power war for the acquisition of other people's territory would cease, and empires would dissolve into their component parts, that is into aggregations of people who feel themselves as a separate nation.

As examples of people who have had to struggle these many years to retain their individuality, simply because they had neighbors bigger than themselves we could mention Finland, Poland, Ireland, and a great many more. An international court might even decide in favor of restoring Palestine to the Jews, provided it could be done with the consent of and without injury to the people now occupying that land.

Laws and courts are nothing unless there is a power to enforce the decisions, and only the combined forces of all nations are able to insure such an enforcement.

According to democratic principles the expenses incurred by conducting international affairs, including bringing delinquent nations to terms, should be borne equally by all nations in exact proportion to their population.

The unification of all nations by the principle of democracy is a fascinating idea; though it be only a dream, it kindles in our hearts an earthly ambition to make our globe the greenest and fairest of all worlds, and to make the social condition on earth the envy of the universe.

After this digression we shall go back to our Republic. And this is the weakness of republics that they, as such, do not sufficiently stimulate or give play to imagination, leaving the creative faculty to be occupied and the mind to be filled with images and sentiments more or less foreign or antagonistic to its principles.

As earth needs an atmosphere in order to sustain life, the Republic needs a heaven reflecting its ideals, a heaven fostering social forms wherein individuals imbued by its spirit shall flourish and in turn support it.

The importance of the atmosphere cannot be overestimated, though it appears to be filled only with mist, rainbows and drifting clouds. Is it not the mould into which the stream of life is poured? And are we not formed according to its conditions? What is any civilization but a more or less artificial heaven? And in this, imagination more than reason dominates and decides the outcome.

The power of this atmosphere to determine the form and in consequence thereof the characters of individuals within that atmosphere was recently shown by a Scientist who ascertained that the skull of the children of emigrants coming to this country including those born on the other side of the Atlantic were altered so as to conform to an American type. And when we consider the

sameness of the innumerable influences that hourly, daily and yearly press upon and floats through the minds of the young, we do not wonder at this, and, in our republic especially, this tendency to produce a uniform type must be considered beneficial. But carried too far it shall crush out all individuality and with it the only material able to sustain free institutions.

To counteract this tendency somewhat and facilitate a more free formation of character, the new social forms which we have named utopias should prove efficient, filling the function of families, churches, fraternities, etc., but different from these.

The republic is not an utopia, perhaps it was not so conceived to be. To us it is like a sea wherein utopias may appear and again be dissolved, and not only utopias but all other organizations lesser than itself can therein come to be and again be dissolved into its component parts, that is into individuals.

As a characteristic that differentiates utopians from the members of most associations, we shall point out that the missionary spirit is not in us. We have no salvation to offer, only a hard task for those who are idle and who are aching for something to do. Black sheep of the families, heretics, nonconformists or lost souls generally, and to this class utopians shall recommend themselves.

They should also recommend themselves to others. Based on the principles of the Republic and dependent on free institutions, they should in time of trouble prove its strength and stay.

The family is not dependent on the Republic. In fact the family institution, by causing all wealth to be accumulated into the hands of a few families has been the bane of all republics until now, and while families thrive just as well and better under absolutism their endurance under democracy shall depend on some counteracting influence to hold them in check, otherwise they shall be consumed by their own avarice.

The appearance of utopias, by clearing the atmosphere, ought to be beneficial to religious bodies, provided they are not of a nature that require foul air, poverty and a breath of the slums. The only genuine members of the religious cults are the Orthodox, those who honestly believe in their creeds and doctrines. A liberal christian or Jew, for example, is only a second class christian or Jew, how excellent they otherwise may be, or probably or more often only a common hypocrite. No Orthodox creed holds out any hope for such, nor are they honored among heretics. It seems then that utopias should offer an opportunity for the lukewarm to find or create a place where they could be true to themselves, and also

gain the esteem of their fellowmen. At the same time the Orthodox would get rid of their dead members, and in consequence thereof shine forth in all their purity.

Protestants and many others consider Catholicism a menace to the Republic, but so is Protestantism, too, a menace when it has for its object to make of ours a Christian republic.

There can be no such thing as a Christian republic, as there can be no Mormon or Mohammedan republics, for all these cults are only branches of the same tree, Judaism, and the social ideal of Judaism is a theocracy, the rule of a hereditary priesthood in the name of and by the authority of an invisible God according to revealed and therefore unchangeable laws.

The prevailing sentiment in our Republic is christian, but the hatred of christian sects for one another, a hatred characteristic of all sects that have their origin in Judaism, saves the situation. If one becomes dominant our Republic is doomed. But the church has had its day or rather its night and the memory of the horrors of that night shall forever prevent it from again coming into absolute power.

With more apprehension must lovers of liberty view socialism. As there can be no christian republic, neither can there be any socialistic republic. Socialism is only the latest phase of Judaism and therefore places the authority outside the individual. We are supposed to surrender to class consciousness pure and simple, as formerly to the laws authorized by Jehovah or Allah. Perfect obedience to authority constitutes the perfect man. Self-sacrifice, not self-assertion is the supreme virtue.

Although Socialists ignore the religious question, something like a theocracy under socialism is more than likely, and for this, perhaps, the socialist party is preparing the body and the great universities, the soul. Who should be more fitted for a priesthood than the scientist? And, if what some professors propose to do is any indication of what a priesthood of scientists would do in the name of science, when they shall have the power, what a religious priesthood did in the name of God when they had the power, will be as child's play in comparison.

The idea of an absolute ruler is as yet absent in the socialist movement. But when ardent socialists at last realize that the majority needed to carry out this program does not materialize, who can doubt that they shall welcome the strong man who shall be able to inaugurate the co-operative commonwealth? And who can doubt that some new Constantine shall arise? Taking advantage of the

situation, he shall write upon the blood-red banner of socialism, "In hoc signo vinces" and established some form of despotism in spite of all precautions.

Perhaps socialism is destined to play the same part in a night to come as christianity during the dark ages when the church played the ghost in the ruins of a republic.

Even so, let not your heart be troubled, night has a beauty, all its own. Dreams too, sometimes are beautiful, and after the darkest night, at last comes Lucifer, the son of the morning, and in the fullness of time, Utopias.

Meanwhile we shall endeavor to preserve the machinery of free institutions, and there is no immediate danger of losing the forms, though the spirit be lost already. And remember our declaration of independence.

Washington, D. C. is our holy city, not Rome or Jerusalem, still less Mecca or Benares. The Constitution of the United States is our Book of Laws, not the Bible, or the Roman Laws. We may have borrowed from these and other sources. But so did the nations that were before us borrow from the customs of still earlier social forms. Before God on the summit of Mt. Sinai gave to Moses the great commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," there must have been a law against murder, because Moses himself, long before that time had to flee from Egypt because he had killed a citizen of that country.

Although Washington, D. C. is the sacred heart of our social anatomy and holy unto us as the center of our national life, it is not the seat of a ruler nor the place of an imperial court. It performs its functions automatically and impartially, within the limit set by the will of free individuals operating in the periphery. Our courts are with the people and our kings are in the firing line.

The possible bloom or final fruit of Judaism, the Kingdom of Heaven in earth is not in opposition to the Republic; on the contrary its coming depends on the establishment of free institutions and on the subordination of all forms of theocracy, Jewish, Christian, Mohammedan, Mormon, including aristocracies of birth or wealth.

For all these forms assume that individuals should be ruled from above, from without, and not from the heart or from within. In the Kingdom of Heaven, in our Father's Home where there are many mansions, we can go in and out and be as children. There we have absolute freedom. In the Republic this freedom is necessarily limited to the extent that it shall not interfere with the equal freedom of others. But the principles of the Republic and of the Kingdom of Heaven are the same.

THE HERITAGE AND THE HEIRS

If wealth accumulates and men decay we should not worry. Enough to know that the wealth is there. If we ourselves are not decayed it is ours to have and to hold. Though it be not in our hands at present, with the help of our superior, wealth accumulating device, utopias namely, it shall be ours some day. In anticipation, the joy of possession is ours already.

Generally speaking, a man is the rightful heir to all he can get hold of. How much that shall be depends on the strength of his desires and on his natural endowment and on the same qualities in his co-heirs. In other words, all wealth belongs to the living and among the living to those who are most full of life.

For the sake of convenience we shall divide all wealth into three classes: Material, mental and moral. And for the benefit of utopians give a few examples of who in our opinion are the rightful heirs to different kinds of wealth.

The true heir to the capital of a capitalist, for instance, is the man of enterprise. His son after the flesh may be that man, but again he may not. If he be a miser or a spendthrift or a man of only ordinary ability and ambition there are various and obvious reasons why he should not inherit any capital worth speaking of.

The true heir to the best violin in the whole world is the best performer on that instrument living, regardless of blood relationship. And so we could go down the whole list, but enough to say: The true heirs to all tools are those who can and will use them. Further we shall note that lives of great men all remind us that genius for doing great things is not hereditary, neither is the genius for doing ordinary work hereditary. Further still, history records that statesmen, generals, scientists, artists, inventors, manufacturers, merchants, great men in all fields of endeavor, have sprung from all classes of society.

Nothing seems more reasonable than that the benefits of these men's endeavors should be the heritage of all classes. But here as among individuals the class that takes hold of and utilizes what men of former generations have wrought are the true heirs.

The mental wealth, that is the accumulated knowledge or the experience of our race as written down in books is accessible almost everywhere and practically free to everybody. Consequently this wealth gives not much cause for quarrels among the heirs. To be sure anxious shepherds at times try to prevent their flocks from taking hold of this heritage. So they put their ban on the reading of certain books. But often, as the shepherds themselves now seem to be aware, to forbid the reading of a book tempts

people to devour it, even those who do not like it and therefore ought not to read it. Being aware of this, they try another method, namely to put up a list of seven or twelve or any other holy number of books as the *best*. The intention evidently is that by making people read these they shall be prevented from reading books that may tend to make them rebellious or give them too much insight into the ways of shepherds. I am led to this supposition by reading several such lists. In none of them have I found recommended Machiavelli's "The Prince," or Max Stirner's "The Ego and His Own," not to mention any work of the more modern "honest workmen" like Nietzsche or Ibsen.

Surely this method has its great merits. China was reduced to the reading of Confucius and stagnated for thousands of years. Why should not standpatters and shepherds succeed in bringing us to a standstill by an exclusive reading of Shakespeare and the Bible?

Utopians shall not furnish any list. What we need we take freely. For in regard to mental food more than in regard to physical nourishment the saying holds good that what is one man's meat is another man's poison. As the wild animals seek the food that is good for them and instinctively avoid what is poisoning, so we shall read what we please.

Our moral wealth consists mainly in ideals. These ideals are not only free, they are thrust upon us. From our earliest infancy ideals are impressed on our plastic minds so deeply that few are those who in later life are able to eradicate these earlier impressions. While we can say that the possession of material wealth and of knowledge that it is all good, not so in respect to ideals. They may be bad, or they may be out of date or at variance with later ideals, also contrary to a better understanding; and if we cannot get rid of earlier ideals and their influence our will is divided and our forces scattered.

To say that we have ideals is hardly correct. The ideals have us; we are for our weal or woe possessed by them. National, racial and religious ideals are often an inheritance that perpetuate hatreds that only utopias shall be able to eradicate. But that does not mean that those ideals should not be perpetuated in a modified form. The same may be said of the family ideal, although it gave rise to innumerable feuds. It is today and for many generations to come the only social ideal that the great majority shall adhere to, the only ideal that for most men is an inspiration strong enough to call forth their greatest energies. But it is not the only ideal, and for a great many not the highest. There are the utopian ideals.

STANDPATTERS

Almost everybody is progressive in our days. Already we have progressive conservatives. Soon, perhaps, we shall hear about progressive reactionaries.

Why not? There are many indications that we have progressed in a wrong direction and the only sensible thing to do then, it seems, would be to go back to the beginning and try another way. As utopians we ought not blindly accept everything that styles itself progressive nor reject any idea because it is old. Many ideas and ideals and customs of former days might with great advantage be introduced in our utopias, modified of course to fit into the changing conditions.

But while the great majority are favorably disposed toward the new, that is, progressive ideas, there still remains a formidable force of standpatters. Standpatriotism is a fact, and standpatters like other facts are stubborn things, and shall have to be reckoned with.

The first thing we must do is to recognize them for what they are, namely, as standpatters; that is, as people that cannot change. By this recognition much friction shall be avoided and we shall then be better able to fit them into new social structures or use them as stepping stones to utopias.

An insight into this spirit of standpatriotism we glean from folklore. There we read that the goblins who play during the night sometimes forget themselves and linger too long, that is, until a ray of the rising sun touches them. Then they are not quickened into new life thereby but turned into stones, and nothing can change them any more. . .

Something similar to this takes place in our own time, and it is fascinating to observe this strange effect of light on the adherents to creeds and cults dating from dark ages. Instinctively and voluntarily they close their minds to new revelations of truth. Soon they are petrified. Having ears they do not hear, having eyes they do not see, but are as it were entombed.

It is a calamity to be thus imprisoned in a faith, like Job for example. The Lord took away his property, his wife, his children and the respect of his fellowmen. Afflicted with loathsome diseases, at last he sat on an ash pile scraping his sores with a piece of pottery. Still he was faithful to his God and cried out: "Even though He slays me, yet I shall trust in Him."

The case of Job is not an isolated one. Most people who have been through the terrible ordeal of changing faith have examples of this stubbornness. When Olaf—later St. Olaf—converted the Norwegians to Christianity, he met with many obstinate characters. One Olve would have nothing to do with the new faith or new

morality, as they more correctly termed it. But finally Olaf caught Olve, tied him to the ground, put an iron pan on his body and in that pan lit a fire and tried in this way to convert the old heathen. But Olve refused to be thus persuaded, and when the red-hot iron at last burned into his stomach he simply said: "I see that Thor has forsaken his people, but he shall not be ashamed of his son."

He stood pat and died bravely without accepting Christ.

It is no use denying it, we all admire the steadfastness of Job and the fortitude of the less celebrated Olve.

All cults, the organic world itself, stands pat. Every organization must have some fixed ideas or principles, otherwise they must fall to pieces. Utopias themselves shall not be exempt from that necessity. This characteristic of all created things to remain unchanged and persist, long after the, to them, favorable conditions which brought them into existence have passed, has enriched our world with innumerable varieties.

There can be no desire on the part of utopians to diminish the number of social forms as it is our avowed purpose to create still more of them.

Preservation is a beautiful thought. It is sad to think of any plants or animal or tribe of men as extinct. And in our ideal commonwealths room must be found for all existing forms—radicals, conservatives, Gypsies and wandering Jews.

It is the separation from the old that cost. All birth is painful, and more painful among the higher species than among the lower. Often both mother and child perish or are maimed for life. The new is tied to the old with a thousand strings of which they are not aware until they realize that separation is the only solution of the difficulties.

A member of a family perhaps is touched by a spirit that makes him grow. Consequently he craves more room and larger scope for his activities and almost invariably he will try to infuse into the family the same spirit and almost invariably too with the same result: Either needlessly prolong the pain of separation or disrupt the whole family.

In religious cults this struggle is still more apparent. If a man outgrows his creed he, instead of quietly withdrawing, tries the impossible, namely, to make the old form expand to meet his own needs.

In political parties we observe the same process, for instance, recently within the Republican party. The fixed idea of that party was and is high protective tax or tariff. Now some within that party wanted the tax reduced and obtained a promise, put in the platform of that party, that it should be done. But when it came

to acting upon it, the Republican party reduced the tariff *upward*. It could not do otherwise and still be the Republican party. The inevitable result was the birth of a new party. But the pain of separation and the bitterness engendered imperiled the life of both.

This pain and bitterness, however, seems to be nature's means to make separation complete, to make reconciliation impossible, as the struggle of reformation separated Protestant from Catholic for the rest of their lives.

UTOPIAS

THE THREE KINDS

We imagine our utopias to be many and not two of them alike, but for the sake of convenience we shall divide them into three classes: The Instinctive, The Intelligent, and The Composite.

The Instinctive utopias are the families.

The Intelligent utopias are similar to a king's or queen's court, created by individual initiative and fitted into the social fabric under the laws that govern families, churches, fraternities, corporations, etc.

Composite utopias contain within themselves intelligent utopias as well as the other organizations mentioned above, all of them in a harmonious relationship, and forming an integral part of the republic like the country or township.

INSTINCTIVE UTOPIAS

The family is the only utopia in which the majority of men believe. It needs no advocate, it is instinctive or natural. This social ideal, the family, exists, have existed and shall exist under a variety of forms. But we need only discuss the family founded on the monogamic marriage. And, as it is already established, we shall limit ourself to the task of pointing out that it is inadequate and that it calls for utopias of another kind.

Scarcely any of us can be confined within the narrow circle of the present home and feel content. And while the churches to the extent that they fill a social as distinct from a religious want, if such a distinction can be made, and the numerous clubs, societies, fraternities, etc., including the saloon, may be a satisfactory supplement to family life for a great many, in our opinion, the utopias here contemplated would be preferable. Social organization, apart from home, generally caters to members of one sex and to in-

dividuals of the same age. Thereby we become unduly divided socially. Our will and interests are scattered and our forces wasted, nothing is gained thereby and a great deal lost.

Let us briefly examine some of the social forms which the social limitations of the family bring into existence. First—secret societies. These, beside their social function, have this for their special purpose, to mould the character of their members into certain forms. Since these moulds are rigid, to the extent these orders succeed, a social readjustment is retarded or made impossible. Recruited, as they are, from the socially most promising element makes their activity all the more menacing. Materially and intellectually unproductive, they are a parasitical growth, a fungi on the tree of life, blind alleys leading nowhere. No laughing children, nothing but dead men comes out of them. Their impressive funeral rites cannot hide the secrets of their barrenness.

Still these fraternities, from the earliest ages, bear witness to the fact that the family is not sufficient to meet our social wants.

Fraternities appear to be an attempt on the part of man, to lift himself above the plane of instinct which the family represents, the ties of blood, the bondage of marriage, etc. This is most clearly shown in the organizations of celibate priesthoods. But this flight from woman and the family is as universal as the longing for freedom and nothing especially religious.

The Vikings towards the last formed themselves into brotherhoods, and no women were admitted into their strongholds. The Cossacks, too, wild and free warriors of the Steppes, had their burgh from which women were excluded.

That this longing for a larger and freer social life than that which the family circle offers, is shared by woman also is evident from the existence of women's clubs, and women's active participation in church work. That woman, as a rule, sticks close to home, probably means only this, that they are more closely bound to their children. Not that their longing for a larger and freer life is less.

But the modern clubs offer us only a temporary escape from family life. Otherwise, it was with organizations of Vikings and Cossacks. They had a life of adventure and bold enterprises, compared with this, the life in clubs and lodge rooms is stagnation, dissipation, and a slow death.

It is of special interest for utopians to find out what constitutes the secret of success of social organization, more especially the

fraternities, for we never cease to wonder how large social bodies of this kind can rest upon and grow out of so little that it is next to nothing.

It is told of Pythagoras that he took all the degrees of the Egyptian priesthood, a secret society, and that he, when he was initiated into the innermost circle, where the mystery, so carefully guarded, was to be revealed, he found nothing.

A mysterious nothing, a Nirvana, seems to be an ideal foundation. Does not the whole world of phenomena emerge from and rest upon nothing? Anything that is something is sure to repel somebody, but this nothing, like a vacuum, offers no resistance and exerts an irresistible attraction.

A lodge room is probably the nearest we can come to a vacuum socially, and to get a quorum is no small task. This, however, is not a weakness but a source of strength. In the lodge room the members touch the negative pole of existence and are electrified. They feel the urge to do something, and, as there is nothing doing there, the only thing they can do is to go out and get new members to fill the vacuum, which again is something which in the nature of things cannot be done, and the order grows.

If we at times have a vague feeling of the hollowness of it all we argue like this: How could so many great and able men belong to a given order if there was nothing in it?

The strength of the churches, too, consists in their emptiness of anything of real interest to men. And what can the members do for a God that is spirit? Nothing but go out and bring men to God or join the church, and when we wonder why, we hear the same argument: How could so many great and able men belong to the church if it be only a bottomless pit?

Woman, like churches and secret societies, attracts men, and ought to be mentioned in this connection. Woman is a mystery we cannot fathom. And, like anything we cannot understand, capable of creating a superstitious fear in our hearts. Someone has said that woman is a mystery and that the solution of that mystery is always the child. This is hardly correct. The child is not a solution but the coming forth of a new mystery—a new member from within. The mystery deepens the more we think of it. Otto Weininger had the notion that the absolute woman is nothing, or the uncreated seeking existence, or as we would say, she is a vacuum. Woman as mother, however, seems a reasonable proposition. Woman as prostitute is more mysterious and we cannot help wondering why such a thing should be. But, if we

wanted to take the opposite view, we know the argument: If the prostitute is nothing, how is it that so many great and noble men, etc., etc.?

Prostitution is an indication that the monogamic marriage, on which our family is founded, is defective.

Perhaps we were two in the beginning, but this does not necessarily mean that we shall be so in the end. In the monkey family, we understand, that the Gorilla is monogamous, while the Chimpzee is inclined to polygamy. Man, it seems, is not bound to any particular form. In the beginning, more than likely, man had no marriage at all, but like most herding animals, had everything in common. Prostitutes may then be regarded as non-conformists representing the original type. Perhaps their existence is a protest against all marriages imposed upon us because of the hardness of our hearts. For, if there were no marriages, there would be no prostitutes nor any divorces, for the first cause of divorce is, of course, marriage. But, in saying this, we do not wish to be understood as favoring prostitution. We prefer the mother for the Magdalene. And it seems to us that the sympathy that goes out to those who have followed the easiest way is somewhat misplaced, if we with the right place, mean that it should be with those who have the hardest time of it. While prostitutes are supported in idleness and luxury, many a poverty stricken wife and mother must work hard at home and away from home. It is here that the hardness of our hearts comes in. Harder, too, than the lot of prostitutes is the fate of intelligent girls, who, having the choice of becoming the wife of a poor man or become prostitute, refuses to be either, and remains single. If this be the essence of tragedy, that a person is placed in a position that no matter where he turns he is bound to be sacrificed, their fate is tragic.

To meet the needs of those an enlarged family or utopia is required. An utopia where we shall have marriages for the preservation of the race and romances to preserve our health, and the summer gladness in our souls.

Economically, the family offers no security whatever, that is, for an overwhelming great majority. It was a time when people were more closely in touch with the soil, when the homestead gave some protection to the members of the family, but this time is no more. Scattered in all directions, each is left to shift for himself. Only one family in a thousand, perhaps, reaches a state of affluence that enables it to be a friend in need to its nearest kin, not to mention the poor and more distant relations.

The growth of innumerable life insurance companies proves the economic weakness of the family. And to the extent outside

organizations take charge of its affairs, the family itself must disintegrate. Insurance is a gamble. A non-producing business. The patrons of a gambling house occasionally win, and the insured regularly do, though on the whole, the game is in favor of the companies. And in the long run the gambling house shall get the money. With the same players this would be accomplished in short order, but new victims keep the game going.

We can easily see the economic advantage of having a larger social unit than the family but to prefer it is another matter. Stronger than reason are the mysterious bonds of blood and race and the instinct to care for our own. Only as a person becomes more conscious of his worth, in other words, individualized, shall his craving for a greater freedom than what the family gives make him seek utopias.

That the home is an ideal place for children up to a certain age, let's say, seven years, we shall take for granted, provided the parents are sensible and decent. But as time passes on the watchful care of a mother over her children at last becomes unbearable to them. Further, it is often demanded of a boy, that he shall attain what the father failed to do, even though their ideas and ideals differ, as they almost invariably do.

The greater the father the more dangerous is he to the son. Already our heathen ancestors were aware of this menacing influence of the father. And the chieftains among them sent away their sons to be fostered by lesser men.

It is dangerous for any one, but most for a boy, to live too close to a powerful man. Like a young sapling growing too near a big tree wilts in its shadows, so he is blotted out of existence, absorbed by the more powerful.

INTELLIGENTUTOPIAS

Assuming that there is a desire to create an intelligent utopia, the first thing to do is to form a definite idea of its character. This, for practical men, and for many others, is no easy task. We therefore suggest that poets and others, like pioneers and singers of a new day, go to work, and in a playful way, write down their ideas of an ideal commonwealth, and give to practical men, inclined to attempt something of that sort, some ideas to select from. Such written utopias would fill the same want as plays and musical compositions do to actors and musicians.

The value of these utopias shall depend largely on this, that it is possible to create them under present conditions and with existing characters.

As to the mode of presenting the matter, we wish to call at-

tention to the fact that poets, as a rule, succeed better when they give a description of Hell than when they attempt to picture Heaven. Taking that hint, a poet could with great advantage, write a tragedy containing the basis principle of this utopia. And he need not fear that a sad or terrible ending of his utopia shall prevent anyone from trying to introduce into real life an ideal commonwealth based on his ideas. The many unhappy marriages, and all the wretched homes does not prevent the rush into matrimony. Misery exerts a strange attraction, and as the saying is, it likes company. Happiness is tedious.

In writing utopias we can learn a great deal from the playwrights. And this is perhaps the rule whereby a good play is written: Given a plot and having chosen his leading characters, he broods over his theme until these, the children of his fancy, become alive, and to a certain extent, independent. And if he puts them in a given situation, they will say and do things that surprise him, their creator. God and his ways are unknown to us, otherwise we should lose our sense of independence, dearer to us than life itself. So it is required that an author of an utopia or a play should remain in the background, preferably hidden like a "spider behind phenomena." The minute he imposes his personality on the play, the play is spoiled.

There is a doubt in many minds as to who wrote Shakespeare's plays. But we can safely infer that this controversy would hardly interest the real author whoever he was. On the other hand, if he is in position to see and hear what is going on here on earth, we feel sure that it would grieve him to see his plays butchered, and that it would give him a keen pleasure to see them given an adequate performance.

The play is the thing.

Most likely utopias shall have in various plays their prototypes, and be like tragedies, dramas, comedies, farces, and some, no doubt, shall be like a continuous vaudeville.

Civilization requires a division of the tasks to the performers, but the actor need not be identified with his part, and should be able to throw it off. So long as the performance lasts, it is necessary that there should be kings, heroes, minor characters and a chorus, but when the curtain drops these distinctions drop with it as far as social intercourse is concerned, and the king and the grave-digger, the wise man and the fool may have supper together if they so choose.

And our ideal is that the parts should be chosen and acted voluntarily, be it for the love of the rôle itself, or for the love of

doing hard things or performing tasks others are unwilling or unable to perform, that is, in the heroic spirit, latent in humanity. As to organizing, a king may choose his idea of an utopia and his follower, like a director selects his piece and engages his players. Or the players may decide on an utopia and select or call a king.

The first task of a practical king must be to put his utopia on a sound economic basis.

The three bogies: rent, interest, and profit, should be queered or made harmless. It can be done.

If we own the ground or land necessary for our support and the houses thereon—and we have the right to do so—then we pay no rent.

If we don't owe anybody anything—and we don't need to do so unless it be our share in the national and municipal debt—then we shall pay no interest.

If we produce things for our own use and for the exchange for products of other producers without the help or interference of middlemen—and we are perfectly free to do so—the paying of profit is eliminated, and the utopia is free because it pays no tribute to foreign powers.

Many a man has made himself independent to that extent, starting with nothing and raising a large family beside. What should we think of a king and his men if they could not do that much?

From the start, of course, food, clothing and shelter must be secured, but when our aim shall be to do away with labor, many things now considered necessary to do and to have shall be dispensed with. As such, we shall mention domestic animals, on account of the more or less disagreeable work connected with keeping them. Instead we shall cultivate and depend on animals that are able to maintain themselves in a given locality to furnish us with meat, hides, wool, etc. To hunt down the enemies of the species preferred is even now considered a noble sport and that is all the cultivation needed in this instance. So agriculture, with all the labor involved, must give place to the cultivation of food-producing trees and plants capable of yielding spontaneously what we need. This cultivation, too, a spontaneous, and therefore pleasureable expenditure of our surplus energies.

These occupations combined with the making and operation of machinery, shall not dull our brains like drudgery. And while it shall keep and develop the skill of our hands, it shall not spoil their softness.

When our minds shall be lifted from the all absorbing interest

and necessity of producing things for profit, we shall realize that many things that we now undertake and do need not be done, or could be done differently, easier, simpler. An ideal food and an ideal drink, for instance, might be prepared from the most various kinds of raw material as whiskey is made out of different kinds of fruits and cereals. Children perhaps shall require somewhat the same kind of nourishment as what is now given them, but for adults, this ideal food and drink ought to suffice like nectar and ambrosia did for the gods.

As the primary needs of man at a court would be free to all as in a family, the style of our food, clothing, and shelter could not be made the measure of an individual's social standing, nor could possessions of property increase his power within the court. Under these circumstances, a tendency towards simplicity should be expected, and would have to be counteracted by a cultivation of a taste for luxuries in order to maintain the dignity of the court. To set the fashion has always been the main function of a court. This, however, does not mean that it should lead in extravagance. Freed from paying tribute, and the necessaries being secured, a surplus fund, or sufficient capital to insure the safety of the court and those depending on it, should be created.

But here the communism of the court ends. To attain that end is the function of the king. And as his activity properly comes within the communistic sphere, though not necessarily confined thereto, he would have no power to grant his followers any pecuniary benefits, but as a leader, he would have power to give as a reward for the faithful performance of a given task, the opportunity to perform a still greater one.

It is essential that the members of a court, beside the communal, should also have a personal interest and personal property and a sufficient sum of money deposited. This latter would make them free to depart any time their own welfares or the welfare of the court required it.

The natural way to acquire that sum would be to swell the surplus fund beyond the needs of the court and distribute it in the form of a dividend. But it might also be acquired individually, or by smaller groups within the court, who for this purpose, wanted to exert themselves beyond the needs of the community.

Utopian's morals or manners must of course be formed according to the broad principle laid down by St. Paul. "Everything is lawful but not everything is profitable." How to apply that principle is also stated by the same authority. "Try everything and cleave to that which is good." This method, it will be observed,

is the same as that followed by scientists in their laboratories and elsewhere. And it is to the everlasting credit of the apostle that he proposed the experimental method in the realms of morals.

To this will be objected that it is a dangerous method. But we are bound to admit that it is the only method whereby the virtue of any mode of conduct can be verified. And why should it not be dangerous? Assuming that courage is a virtue, the element of danger in moral experiments furnishes a test whereby the courage of the experimenters can be proved, and to begin with, demonstrate their fitness in this respect for the undertaking.

The freedom of the experimenters must of course be limited by the laws of the Republic and also thereby that the morals must be in accordance with its fundamental principle—the freedom of the individual.

In full accordance with the laws and in perfect agreement with its principles and with the precept: "To thy own self be true," the moral code of an intelligent utopia may start with the proposition that each individual belongs to him or her self. Children do not belong to their parents nor the parent to their children. Sisters do not belong to their brothers nor brothers to their sisters in any sense that gives them dominion over one another.

The marriage relation within a court must be managed in the same manner. A woman should retain her own name, her taking her husband's name is a remnant of the idea that women are property. The reflected glory or disgrace resulting from being married to a famous or infamous man would no longer be womans. Her glory, as far as marriage is concerned, would be her children. Apart from them, a woman's claim to distinction would be the same as that of man—character, beauty, ability, accomplishments.

Next, a man or a woman's property should not, in the least, be affected by a marriage relation. This would put an end to the disgraceful sport of hunting heiresses. This as well as the profession of the prostitutes and any other traffic in sex should, of course, be banished from an intelligent utopia.

The outcome of these experiments in morals or modes of conduct adopted must necessarily vary in the different utopias.

As an illustration, we shall introduce the question of clothes. And that there is a close connection between clothes and morals no one will deny. Here we see at once the absurdity of being bound to the fashion of our forefathers and the even greater absurdity of making the style uniform, for the whole world regardless of climatic condition and the modes of making a living.

Our body is the original clothing of our souls. We are born

naked, but by the help of intelligence, we, with drapery and trinklets, can make our body appear to better advantage and with clothes add to its comforts.

The cultivation of polite manners and the observances of good usages is an extenuation of the clothing principle, a striving after a better appearance.

But in matter of morals, with a few exceptions, we all stand pat. Not because we approve of all our customs or are not aware that they might be greatly improved, but it is the same kind of obedience we practice in regard to clothes. We may realize that they are both ugly and uncomfortable, still we conform, and if we saw someone defying the reigning fashion and appear in a new style, that in our own estimation, was both beautiful and sensible, the chances are that we in spite of that should ridicule and, perhaps, maltreat the offender.

It follows that considerable tact and diplomacy shall be needed in order to realize our own peculiar moral ideals. Many reformers and would-be innovators are looked upon as undesirable citizens simply because they want to force their ideas upon others. As utopians have no intention of doing so, some of the prejudice against innovators may disappear. It should be a relief for agitator as well as for those agitated upon, if a multitude of different utopias were in existence. Instead of trying to make the whole nation conform to my ideal, I myself could then depart from the neighborhood when its customs no longer appealed to me and settle in another where the degree of temperance or indulgence in all things were more agreeable to me.

To facilitate an exchange of members between the different utopias and also the absorption and elimination of members from and to the community at large, it would be well, even necessary for an utopia of the kind at present discussed, to fill a function that would put it in direct touch with all people. Isolation and secrecy creates suspicion and, while insisting on the same right to privacy that families enjoy, a function that made the absorption an elimination of members free and easy should be of mutual benefit.

A few functions of that kind comes to our mind.

"Eternal vigilance as the price of Liberty." And if we shall have liberty, and if the republic on which it and our utopias depends shall endure, equality before the law must be maintained. It is therefore fitting that a King's court should form itself into a vigilance committee for the purpose of realizing that ideal. The prevailing opinion is that the poor are at a disadvantage in the courts because they cannot engage the right kind of lawyers. Here

the legal lights of an utopia could come to the rescue and give the needed counsel free. An utopia, like a corporation, must of course, have one or several good lawyers in order to succeed, by helping it to steer clear of legal entanglements, especially shall their counsel be needed if an innovation of new customs or morals is contemplated, as both the utopia as a whole and the members composing it need attorneys, the assistance given the poor by this class would simply be an extension of their special occupation.

Assuming this position, however is fraught with danger. This service could easily be carried too far and would be apt to create an antagonism against a court from the start. It also suffers from this defect, as a connecting link with the rest of the community, that it only occasionally shall come into use.

A more neutral and abiding function is that of a funeral director. Acting as funeral directors would bring the court in contact with the outer world at an opportune time. At such times, children are often left without supporters or guardians and could be adopted, or parents in losing a child—often lose their only support, and would need a place of rest. Death often brings about a reconciliation of the members of a family, some of whom, during the time of trouble, might temporarily have taken refuge at a court, and would now return to the bosom of their family. Some new customs could here be introduced, cremation, to begin with, should recommend itself to an intelligence utopia. And the extravagant offerings of flowers is surely a bad form which ought to be discouraged. Verily, a flower, picked at the wayside and placed on my coffin by a real mourner, one who felt my going away as a real loss, would be worth more to me than all the flowers the indifferent ones could buy.

With a beautiful funeral rite of their own, and the liberty of others to use a different one, many, no doubt, would avail themselves of their service. Especially since this as well as other functions assumed as a connecting link should be rendered free, that is, with the element of profit eliminated, what this means in this instance, we realize when we consider that a coffin that is sold for fifty dollars can be manufactured for five.

Outside of those engaged in the business, no serious opposition to a court assuming the function of a funeral director need be anticipated. The coffin trust has no friends and the undertakers are too closely connected with it to expect much sympathy.

But in the ranks of the standpatters the position of the middleman is the least defensible. This position, too, when taken, offers

the greatest opportunities. It connects the courts with the bases of supply, and from this stronghold, it is possible to branch out in any and all directions.

A commission appointed to inquire into the causes of the high cost of living come to the conclusion that half of that cost goes to the middleman. This may be an exaggeration, but anyway it does not matter. A court can defy all competition if it takes the position of the middleman, that is, if it undertakes to fill the function of the middleman as a public service voluntarily offered with no extra charges for profit. It is a function that requires no skill and not much strength of muscle and only a minimum of brains. A slot-machine is an ideal middleman.

It has often been stated that nine out of ten who start in business fail, taking that to apply also to the business of the middleman, we wish to state, that they do not fail because they are unable to perform the function assumed. They fail to get customers, and consequently fail to get anything out of the fifty per cent profit that is paid by the ultimate consumer, that's all.

The producers of all kinds of articles are anxious and willing to deliver their goods at any place a middleman may wish. At such places the function of the middleman begins and ends. For the delivery of the goods at the homes of the customers is not properly the function of the middleman, but that of parcel deliverers or similar agencies.

When the idea of profit and the necessity of getting customers is eliminated and the business of the middleman is limited to its proper sphere, namely, to the ordering of goods and retailing them, some radical changes in the conducting of that business must be looked for.

It is a wonder that municipalities do not overtake the business of the middleman. Perhaps they will some day. Meanwhile, utopians can do it, and as these are not financially interested, only socially, so a new science of salesmanship may be outlined.

Now the main object is to sell, then absolute neutrality, like that of a slot-machine, would be the ideal a salesman should be striving for. As a voluntary social service commercialism would be sanctified, and under this sanctified commercialism, a customer would be sure to receive the goods as represented as there would be no motives to misrepresent the articles on the part of the salesman. The customer's will and welfare would be the sole consideration. Many customers do not know what they want—they only know that they want something. Probably, in many instances, all a customer wants is to look at the goods. And, if a salesman

could satisfy a customer in that way, without making any sale, it should be put down to his credit as it might be to the advantage of the customer in question.

Advertising, even the display of articles for sale in show windows, shall be considered superfluous or vulgar. In regard to foodstuff, every one will admit that it does not increase our appetite to see it exposed in windows and doorways. It is not the proper way.

Our garments and our jewelry are cheapened by being exposed as advertisements. It makes us look second class, for no matter what we put on we cannot successfully compete with a show window.

The stores could be reconstructed or done away with and replaced by bazaars or markets, as the needs or convenience of the customers demanded. Once or twice a week would be sufficient for many departments, and for others only a few hours in the forenoon or evening.

As to place, these markets need not be on the most expensive streets. We take it for granted that an intelligent utopia first must secure a sufficient tract of land but its position shall be greatly strengthened if it owns property to an adjoining city as well. The advantages of this are too numerous to mention and easily suggest themselves to parties interested. Here we shall only dwell with the advantages the market place offers as a connection between an intelligent utopia and the rest of the community.

That it would facilitate the absorption by the court of children and others especially fitted for it and the elimination of those not in harmony with it, is self-evident. Equally self-evident, it is that the manners, morals or customs of the court would here directly affect the whole community for its weal or woe.

The members of an intelligent utopia, to begin with, we shall assume to have the artistic temperament to the extent at least that they like to do things principally for the pleasure it gives. But, it would be to the benefit of such occasionally, or even regularly, to force themselves to do something which they do not like to do. This shall strengthen their will and act as a disciplinary measure and discipline of some kind, even if self-imposed, or preferably so, is needed.

Many, who by force of circumstances, in our days must work at tasks disagreeable to them, find relief by taking up some work in which they are interested as a fad. For utopians, who normally are busying themselves with what others take up as a fad, to assume some task not to their liking would amount to the same

thing, only the situation is reversed. And the benefits of such an arrangement shall be the same. An artist serving a few hours now and then in a clothing department for instance, shall gain a knowledge of the human form, otherwise not so easily obtained and the customer shall receive the benefit of professional advice as to what colors and styles are most becoming to him. A poet serving in a book department could not help but increase the interest in the better class of literature, etc.

That a court assuming the function of the middleman, shall reduce the cost of living fifty per cent, we do not believe, and take occasion to caution against any anticipation of that kind. If the middleman was forced into the ranks of professionals and producers, they would give especially to the producers a greater desire for money or the things that money buys. This would lift the life of the whole nation to a higher standard of living, but this implies that what now goes to the middleman, would then be added to the compensation for the activities of professionals and producers, and the ultimate consumer, as such, would gain nothing.

There are other middlemen closely allied to the commercial middleman, namely, the middleman between God and man, that is the priest. Him we shall deal with later on, here we shall dwell for a moment on a middleman that possibly may appear within an utopia, namely, a middleman between me and my king. The minute he appears utopia vanishes. Then the king is no longer a real king, but an idol, like the existing kings, and hedged around by a class of nobles or priests, that is middlemen, and is not my king any more.

This decides the size of an intelligent utopia: It can not exceed the circle of personal acquaintance of the king with all his followers.

Coming back to the commercial middleman, the first thought is, that the only thing for him to do, when a court overtakes his function, is to close up his business with a sacrifice sale. But people are conservative, and no doubt shall continue to trade in the old places and in the old way, and ample time be given for a readjustment.

But many shall, no doubt, question the justice or fairness of this proposition and ask: "What has the middleman done that he should be singled out and sacrificed on the altar of a social readjustment?"

Rather let us ask: What has he done that he should not be sacrificed? His case is not peculiar, in these progressive days, it is a common occurrence for a man to wake up in the morning and

find his occupation gone, for during the night some genius has invented something that shall temporarily put him, the unfortunate one, out of business.

Come to think of it, it is not standpatism, but the very uncertainty of it that makes earth life so fascinating.

COMPOSITE UTOPIAS

There are in the United States today more than two thousand, five hundred counties.

The county shall be the unit of our composite utopias.

These counties vary greatly as to the size of their territory, natural resources, climatic conditions, as well as to the number and the character of their inhabitants, many of them having a larger area and a numerically greater population than the ancient republics, Sparta and Athens.

When we consider that the most successful republics often have been very small, for instance, the Florentine and the Icelandic republics, we are led to infer that pure democracy can best be realized in a territory the size of a county.

While the counties cannot be absolutely independent, being parts of the states and of the republic, local option or home rule for the county, is all that is required for our purposes.

Being parts of the larger body, the republic, gives peace and security, and saves the energies for social work. Within this smaller unit, too, direct votes on all questions pertaining to local affairs by the entire population is practicable, and as this is essential to true democracy, the realization of this ideal is to that extent made possible.

As the county is our unit, we need not enter into the larger fields of politics. If we can make the county right, the republic will take care of itself. But a few words concerning the relation of the county to the state and to the republic are not out of place.

The state rights originally were meant to be a means to protect the people from a too great centralization of power. But the states have grown to an extent that they no longer answer that purpose. Many of them have now a population more than twice as great as the original thirteen states together. Therefore, they have largely lost their usefulness of giving the people a more direct control of the public's affairs. If decentralization of power is something to be desired, the county should be the proper unit.

Though the county has the necessary freedom and independence as it is, we shall, nevertheless, state what to us seems desirable in the line of change, namely, that the state legislatures should be chosen by counties, regardless of the number of the population. Likewise, the federal congress by states, if for no other reason than this—that it is in accord with the principle of democracy as quoted elsewhere.

As individuals have equal rights as individuals, regardless of what they possess, so counties and states should have equal rights, regardless of population. Representation according to the number of inhabitants within a social unit, is simply a remnant of the idea that men are property. This idea subtly steals into the collective mind. Counties, cities, states, measure their greatness according to the number of their citizens, and assume that numbers give additional rights. The republic recognizing the individual as the unit, should also regard its separate parts as individual units with equal rights.

No one doubts that each of the three millions people who founded this republic compares favorably with each of the hundred millions living today. And no one will doubt that men from sparsely settled counties may be just as wise and good as the citizens from the more densely populated districts.

We must touch upon another matter of importance in the relation of the county to the republic. The public servants have many idle moments, and in these idle moments, they indulge in, as we hope, idle dreams. Their favorite dream is to develop a partly hereditary class of officials, ultimately, a ruling class. No small ambition that. The civil service laws, by the way, are favorable to the development of this idea.

The county is in a position to effectually counteract this tendency. Being a miniature republic, and as such an excellent training ground for the offices of the state and the republic, the officials of the county could be promoted to the higher units by the county and recalled to the county or replaced to private life as soon as they showed any tendency to forget their place.

Next, we have the military class. The officers of the army and navy have the same tendency to become clannish, to form a class apart from the people. Here again, the county could do efficient service by counteracting this tendency.

Let the police force of the county form the nucleus of the military forces of the republic, preferably receiving their pay from

the counties, and each county being under obligation to furnish a given quota of soldiers or policemen to the state or to the republic in case of emergency.

It would undoubtedly be beneficial in many respects, if all the boys were separated from their parents and given a military training for two years, their fifteenth and sixteenth. Most boys, when they graduate from the public schools, at the age of fourteen, are tired of study, both their mind and body need physical exercise and a life in the open air. Drilling and sport, and the acquirement of the skill of the use of arms and the discipline needed for concerted action, combined with the theoretical and practical knowledge of surveying and military and civil engineering, would not only make them fit material for an army in case of emergency, but give them a military bearing and a sense of comradeship not easily acquired in any other way. Besides this, they would be weaned from their parents, and what is probably more important, the parents would be weaned from them. This separation from the parental influence would also give the boys time and opportunity to decide for themselves their future career.

Having decided on the county as the size of our composite utopia our next move must be to make it independent of all organizations apart from those of the republic. While private utopias, families, churches, fraternities, and corporations may flourish within its borders, they should exist as something external to it, as something not essential to the county's life and well being but be more like an ant hill at the root of a tree, or like owls and eagles or other birds building their nests in its branches.

The public schools we consider an affair of the republic, and while their maintenance rest on the county, the republic must see to it that the teachings are up to the standard, and that it is kept absolutely free from anything of a sectarian nature, religious or utopian. Truth is the same in all counties. There is no sects in arithmetic. Truth is a unifying principle.

As this is in accord with the existing order of things, we shall pass on to the higher education.

While it is necessary that the public education should be compulsory and general, in order to lift the individuals up to the *niveau* required to uphold the principles of democracy, it is not desirable that any higher education should be forced upon any individual. Compulsory education beyond a certain point, be it by the state or by the persuasion of parents and friends, often results in creating an enmity towards the arts and sciences on the part of the un-

happy ones thus imposed upon. And the arts and the sciences are in no way profited by it. On the other hand, it is desirable that higher education should be open to anyone who, at any time, should feel a desire to acquire a greater knowledge, and it is utopian to make this possible.

The scientist is something besides a teacher, though one function need not necessarily exclude the other.

And this is the trouble with the scientist as such that the search for truth is not spectacular, and in consequence thereof, rarely profitable in a pecuniary sense to himself, and in the same sense, not always to others.

As a bread winner, the artist is better situated. Even the least paid of all artists, the poet, has a better chance, and when it comes to the fistic artist, the prize fighter, there is no comparison. Further, a scientist may seek and never find, and then again, he may find some truths that are not palatable to the multitude. Hence, he is, in many instances, dependent on what sometimes is termed, a higher charity. As such, we consider the generous donation to the great universities by men of wealth, and by wealthy denominations.

But the ideals of the rich and the ideals of the churches are not always the ideals of science. Though this, of course, should not, and probably does not, in any way affect the scientist or in any way influence his work, it must at least be annoying if his thoughts are at variance with those of the donors. And it comes to this, that the support of the scientist becomes a vital interest to utopians.

Only a man with a fortune of his own can be said to be in an ideal position materially, to devote his time to the sciences. But the next best should be to be provided for by society. For is he not the rightful heir to some of the material benefits which the work of science has made possible?

Supply and demand fixes the commercial value of any article. Even so of the scientists. If all the counties should make scientific research a part of their activities, the market value of the scientist would be greatly increased.

The problem is to make it possible for a scientist to exist within the county under better conditions than at the great universities, economically more secure, in investigation more free, in giving his ideas to the world, more at liberty.

But of equal or even more importance it must be to inquire, if science itself would be liable to be better advanced in the counties than at the great universities. It would, of course, as a rule, be impossible to compete with them in the matter of laboratories and general equipment, but in many branches, it would be a great ad-

vantage to have trained observers in all parts of the country. A vaster field would then come under the observation of the scientifically trained, and some experiments could be conducted on a larger scale.

In the carrying out of experiments, we can safely assume, that within the boundaries of any county, there are many skilled mechanics and workmen skilled in other lines, who would be glad to lend the scientists their assistance where such assistance was required.

Given an opportunity to assist in this work would tend to increase the interest in, and the love for, the sciences on the part of the people. We are often told that science has done much for us. This breeds antagonism, for it is against our nature to love our creditor. Reverse these conditions and this antagonism ceases.

Though the scientists would be scattered far and wide, they should not necessarily, on that account, feel isolated. Besides all other lines of communication, we take it for granted that at all the county seats, a station for wireless telegraphy would be established, and by these means, the scientists would be in direct touch with one another.

THE CORNER STONE

The heart or center of our county utopias shall be the poor-house. Nothing could be more fit for that purpose. Although it may be the stone which the builders have rejected, we shall nevertheless make it the corner stone of our structure.

The republic has a complete system of life insurances—poor-houses for the poor, hospitals for the sick or insane, and jails for the wicked. Why, then is it that men prefer private institution? We are taxed to support the institutions of the republic and as the taxes in a free country are self-imposed, we ought not to feel any more humiliated by receiving help from the republic than from insurance companies or benevolent associations.

The republic itself goes back on its own system of charity and erects old soldiers' homes. Some advocate pension for mothers and pension for laboring men. What is the matter with the poor-house? If the condition of the poorhouses are not satisfactory, were it not better to improve what we already have than to spend our money and energy in creating new institutions of that kind or supporting private institutions.

The name, poorhouse, is against it. So we shall change that name and call it the Home of the Brave.

The Home of the Brave sounds beautiful, and it would be

an advantage to use that name instead of composite utopias, as it would be more correct to call our intelligent utopias, American Homes. The homes we now have are in no way different from the homes of the Europeans.

To change the name of the poorhouse is easy enough, but it shall be harder to change our sentiment in regard to it. To make it self-supporting, would help a great deal, and it should be possible to turn it into a self-supporting health resort. Having the hospitals, the doctors, the nurses, all that is needed is to enlarge it, or make it like a first class hotel. Many of those, who for a given sum, paid by themselves or others, go to private homes for the old or to orphans homes, would in time, prefer the county institution if it was properly conducted. This would tend to make the poorhouse respectable, and if some prominent citizens made it their permanent home, it would even become fashionable. This idea is not new, it is simply the renewal of the customs of our forefathers. On the larger estates, dependent people like orphans, old people, and invalids were taken care of as a matter of course without any thought that they were paupers or objects of charity.

We are a floating population, we have no roots anywhere, no homes in the older sense of the word, and it is small pleasure to return to the scenes of our childhood and find the old homestead in the hands of a stranger or the apartment building wherein our folks once rented a flat, turned into a piano factory. It would have a sentimental value, at least, to have some spot on earth that we could call our home—a place where we had friends and kindred who would follow our career with some interest, and to which we could return and be sure to find some of our old time associates, where we could roam again in the wildwoods where once we wandered hand in hand with our first sweetheart, so deeply in love that we could not speak, but carved our initials and an arrow-pierced hearts in the bark of green trees.

In charity there is strength. Rich families gain power and permanence by expending some of their wealth to charities, and rich men like to pose, not as possessors, but as stewards of wealth, and enlarge on the grave responsibility possessions incur and on the great risks they take. But when they are about to depart and ought to give an account of their stewardships to the people, they, as a rule, take another great risk and give their fortune to their heirs and assigns forever.

The power of religious bodies, too, rests largely on the supposition that they minister to the wants of the poor, the downcast

in spirit, the sick at heart. Insurance companies and benevolent associations, also derive their strength from the same source, charity.

EXTENSION

"Where our treasures are there our hearts will be also," is a reasonable saying, therefore, a county bank and depository is needed.

But nothing strengthens our affection for a thing more than the opportunity of doing something for it. The activities at our chosen center shall therefore be considered.

The function of the middleman offers itself as the easiest, and could, under proper direction, as suggested before, be performed by paupers and the inefficient. If an intelligent utopia already had overtaken that function, a majority might decide this function ought to be a public affair. In the hands of private parties, it gives an advantage that can easily be misused.

Sooner or later, it must dawn on the consciousness of a majority, that if we want to carry out a more socialistic program, we should begin with what most readily becomes automatic: the operation of lines of communication and transportation, and the function of the middleman. On the other hand, all creative functions ought to be left free: Changing our fashions, changing our needs, changing ourselves in an everlasting attempt at readjustment.

The competitive system in order to be complete, should itself have a competitor in a co-operative system of some kind and the county as an economic unit furnishes that competitor, and as there are people especially fitted for competition, there are others whose character is more in accord with co-operation. Only a few perhaps are so harmoniously developed that their self-interest and public spirit is properly balanced and there ought to be an opportunity for those who take more interest in public affairs than in their own, to follow that inclination and with their efforts counteract the efforts of the activities of those who are onesided the other way, and whose interest are centered absolutely on their own affairs.

To connect the poor farm with a school of agriculture is an easy matter, and the benefit of an institution of this kind within a county would be inestimable.

Work-houses operating in connection with a school of manual training are even more important.

In earlier periods, children were trained in hunting and fishing, and later, in the arts and handicrafts, or in all the activities needed to make a living. So we, too, must realize that children should

have a chance to learn to skillfully handle tools and operate the machinery of modern times, and a chance to acquire a theoretical knowledge of the forces now at our command.

This cannot be done in the homes, as formerly, and very imperfectly in the factories, where the teaching of the child does not largely enter into the bargain, since the output is the main consideration.

Here the manual training schools in connection with the work-houses could meet all demands, first, by giving instruction; secondly, a chance to experiment; and thirdly, be a source of income, both to the county and to the children.

To many business and professional men, a work-house would be a playground, giving them a chance of occupation and an opportunity to follow certain fads, like experimenting, creating and assisting in the manufacturing of beautiful and useful things. In this, they would find rest and recreation and an outlet for the surplus energies, it would also free many from the fear of labor which haunts those who never tried it as the fear of hell in former days.

And it would do away with the contempt for such labor, which still clings to it from the time it was performed by slaves.

A workhouse with modern equipments would tend to make a county independent. If some manufacturers should threaten to stop the wheels of industry or put up the price of their products greatly in excess of the cost of production, then the county, having some wheels of industry of its own to fall back on, and men and people with the skill to operate them, could, in a pinch, for some time at least, produce the article needed.

The cost of the equipment of a model work-house is within the means of the poorest county, and even if it should not prove to be a money-making concern, would be a good investment.

We have lost sight of the fact that the cost of the machinery and tools in many industries is not so very great. Take the garment work, for instance, four millions of people are employed in that branch of industry, and about all the machinery and tools needed are sewing machines, scissors, a tailor's goose, and a few needles.

Knitting machines, too, are inexpensive and easy to operate. So we see, as far as clothes and underwear are concerned, a county need not be dependent on the whims of the great manufacturers. Spinning of the thread and weaving the cloth would require more machinery, but the training in operating these machines would be a great benefit. A blacksmith shop and a machine shop would be indispensable, and could possibly be made to pay by repairing tools

and machines within the county. Another branch of industry that requires but little tools is the building trades, at least, for the erection of smaller structures like cottages and bungalows. A printing press, both for training and for profit is within the means of a county, likewise, machinery for bookbinding. With these equipments and proper instruction, the children of a county could have their own school books printed and bound, and prepare the stationery for the business of the county.

The name "work-house" is good enough, but in order to get away from the idea it now conveys, and to distinguish it from shops and factories, we shall call this combination of a manual training school and work-house a Creatory.

Domestic science for girls fits them for their special task of preparing and preserving the eatables, and any county could easily put up canneries and storage establishments enough to furnish products of that kind for home consumption. And the inhabitants need not be dependent on outsiders or on the enforcement of pure food laws. At any rate, such training would be of great advantage when they were called upon to examine the foods sold in the market.

PRESERVATION

Among the treasures of the county, we must include the originally living forms existing therein: the flowers, the trees, the fish, the animals, the insects, the birds.

To preserve this wealth is difficult, and in order to do so, it would be necessary to have reservations or tracts of the wilderness set aside.

On larger estates, something of this sort is practiced when they lay out great tracts for the preservation of game.

Anything of that sort is impossible when all the land is cut up and made into small farms. But the county, as a whole, could adopt this feature of the large private estates, and select some land for the preservation and cultivation of useful game and other creatures, be it for their beauty alone, or for other reasons.

When we consider the countless ages it has taken to bring into existence every one of the living forms, and that it seems impossible to bring them back to life, once they are extinct, it is with sadness we think of any of them as becoming extinct.

These tracts of land being common property, could in many instances be selected in localities where land is not valuable or fit for cultivation. But even if it were so, it would be worth while. In prairie states, the best way probably would be to have a strip

'of land on the boundary lines of the counties reserved for this purpose. All counties adopting this plan would make the reservation continuous, a great convenience for animals that cannot fly.

Thus, the vanishing forms could be caught and retained in a wonderful net as it were, and from the heights of the aviators, it would appear as if a thin veil were thrown over these United States, enhancing their beauty.

Another reason why the wilderness should be preserved in spots is that it is the natural abode for prophets and hermits. These also ought to be preserved. Prophets were, and are today, the critics of utopias, and the wilderness gives them an excellent opportunity to behold the activities at the center objectively and compare them with the life in the jungle. For while utopianism is an art, and while art is not nature, we need always to be reminded that it should be true to life in its most free expression.

THE HUT

Among other things that ought to be preserved is the hut and the ideal it represents. For, seek as we may, to make the central home magnificent, even if we succeed in this, it cannot replace the hut. And in a composite utopia our aim should be to preserve it. For the ideal of having a home of our own, all our own, cannot be eradicated from our minds. It ought not to be so.

In its proper surroundings, out in the county at the edge of forest, in a flowery dell beside a murmuring brook the hut, is a dream with a peculiar poetic atmosphere.

All this talk about the simple life and the going back to nature only expresses man's longing for the hut, his original home, and for the moment we like to think of utopianism as a renaissance of the hut.

The hut persists. The tenement houses and hovels are nothing but degraded huts.

As an attempt to redeem the hut we consider the building of bungalows. To begin with the bungalow was small as a hut should be. But soon bungalows developed into the size of a mansion and lost all significance as the reappearance of our ancestral home.

The hut is the home of true love. Love in a cottage is common enough but in the hut, if anywhere, are found two hearts that beat as one. So much depends on the size of the dwelling.

Only in castles are morganatic marriages allowed, but in mansions of lesser magnitude soul-mates, affinities and other musk-smelling things can so easily creep in. The very largeness of the residences invites them, and the very spaciousness of the apart-

ments, too, permits the original lovers to drift apart, become estranged and prematurely divorced. As said before, so much depends on the size. The hut excludes not only the above mentioned destroyers of conjugal bliss, but also the lesser evils, relatives, servants, chauffeurs, etc.

True love begets children, and even more than the happiness of the parents, the welfare of the children should be considered. And children seem to prefer the hut even in its degraded condition. The mansions and better class of residences are, comparatively speaking, barren, but in the slums babies abound.

This we cannot help but regret. Rather would we see this condition reversed, that is, see the children in the palaces, as we might prefer to see lilies grow in marble dust. But since the lilies themselves prefer a richer soil, what does it matter to us so long as they grow.

What does it matter if the hut be only a small affair, and patched up with broken boards? In the knot holes, we can put green branches, and the fragrant leaves shall cover the cracks.

If the mother has no money to buy finery for her baby, what does it matter? From fields and forests, she will gather sweet-scented flowers wherewith to adorn the cradle, or, as the case may be, the cracker box doing service as such. Again, what does it matter? The Prince who was born in Bethlehem had not better place.

The hut is the hope of the race.

On the doorstep of the hut, we shall take off our shoes and our hat also, realizing that we are on holy ground, where, to use Longfellow's words, "Life is real, life is earnest, and the grave is not our goal."

Though utopians cannot do much for the hut without destroying its essential features—simplicity and littleness—nevertheless, there are many of the modern improvements in lighting and heating and in other matters that could be adopted for its use, as in a well-constructed bungalow.

While we may doubt the advantage of being born in a hut, there can be no doubt as to the advantages of being raised in the country, near the wilderness from which we came. Mingling with the myriads of living forms there to be found, children have beautiful and true impressions made on their plastic minds, and observing the plants and animals, watching and waiting for their going and coming, gives color to their imagination and flight to their fancy and depth to their consciousness. He who has not seen this world in his infancy, shall probably never see it. Soon we are lost in thought

and blinded by passions, and our minds become crowded with images that obscure our vision. Sometimes, though, it may happen in rare peaceful moments, that all that lies between us and that world passes away, and we regain the immediate perception of early childhood. Then the song of the birds is like hearing again that wonderful lost chord; and the yellowness of buttercups and the blueness of bluebells strikes us as something new and strange.

Can it be that the animals, with brains void of ideas, behold a much brighter world than ours?

A LOVERS' LANE

In connection with the hut, we shall mention an institution that deserves preservation where it already exists, and where this is not the case, its introduction and improvement ought to interest those who want to create a composite utopia. We refer to the lovers' lane. Something like a lovers' lane exists in many places, that is, there are boulevards or avenues where lovers, by common understanding, meet and promenade. And, where no such institution is found, as in the rural districts, it is sadly missed by the young. No doubt one of the reasons why so many young people leave the country, where they are always under the observation of neighbors and friends, and go to the great cities, is that they expect to get greater freedom in love affairs and a wider field for romances. But in the great cities the lovers' lane, like the hut, is found in an utterly degraded condition, under the name of the "red light district." But the fact that a lovers' lane may fall that low does not prove that it is a bad thing; at least, it is an unconscious effort to localize the war between the sexes. Even animals instinctively select playgrounds, where they meet during the mating season. Recognizing and respecting this natural impulse of lovers to meet and facilitate it to a certain extent, shall enable us to put it under intelligent control. Total suppression because of the excesses following in the wake of love, tends to increase these excesses and creates the red light district. A lovers' lane that would do away with this traffic by idealizing, even spiritualizing the love instinct, ought to be seriously considered by all right minded citizens.

Many new problems presents themselves for our consideration as we go deeper into utopianism, and we must limit ourselves to a few hints only in regard to the character of a lovers' lane, but romantic literature must contain many valuable suggestions. If we remember correctly, it should be a winding road, with many byways and paths leading to leafy bowers, grottoes, and mossy banks.

Quaint little inns here and there, where coffee and light refreshments were served is in keeping with its general character. Dancing in a moonlit grove adjoining the lovers' lane would be a valuable addition. Lovers' time is the night time, especially the time of moonlight. To embellish the scene, marble cupids might be placed among the flowers and shrubbery. Singing of serenades to the accompaniment of guitars and mandolins, shall create a poetic atmosphere.

But dancing in the open air makes the participants liable to take cold. To prevent this we should, let the lovers carry an Indian blanket or Scotch plaid in the style of a Roman togo. This garment the lovers could wrap around them when they were resting in the grottoes or on the mossy bank. If the lovers were thus provided, their mothers would not feel concerned about them, and these togas, many colored and perhaps finely embroidered, shall lend color to the lovers' lane.

Let us not for a moment imagine that this arrangement shall lead to free love. Love is not free in nature but a dangerous proposition, and the rivalries of lovers shall make the lovers' lane a dangerous ground. It was customary once, and may be so again, to place some obstacle between a lover and the object of his desire to test the strength of his ardor. The fight and contention we observe among males in the mating season stimulates the lovers to their highest pitch and this temporary heightened vitality, we assume, is greatly to the benefit of posterity. The great importance of this part of utopianism makes experimenting absolutely necessary, and in this as in other matters, let us remember the words of the philosopher: "There are many ways, but *the way* is not."

All lanes must lead somewhere. The lovers' lane should lead, figuratively speaking, to matrimony, and actually to the bungalows. This would be similar to the beautiful custom of putting bird-houses up in the trees for the use of orioles and wild canaries.

MARRIAGE

Following this, a few remarks on matrimony within a composite utopia, are not amiss. That a county, while allowing existing forms of marriage, shall create a peculiar one of its own is more than likely. Let us remember that great changes can be brought about with but a little divergence from the existing order at the start.

Since we have divorce laws, for instance, there is nothing to

prevent that divorces be considered honorable, that is, that it shall become good form to separate when the natural end of all marriages draw near.

That there is a period in a married woman's life, broadly speaking, around the age of forty, when her whole nature instinctively craves a separation from her husband has been observed by many. Pinero in his play, "Mid-Channel" and Karen Michaelis in her book, "The Dangerous Age," call attention to this peculiarity. It seems to indicate that this should be the natural end of a normal marriage. But instead of taking that hint and institute an honorable divorce the moral fadist demands that this critical period be bridged over so that the marriage ideal, that two shall stick together until death do them part, be retained. And, so long as we are not beyond marriage, and so long as we have no social form that can fill the function of the family, it is undoubtedly the most sensible thing to do.

If there is a similar period in married men's life, when a desire for divorce enters their minds, it seems to be less marked, but many have noticed a moral degeneracy in men as they grow older. This degeneracy, however, may be only the awakening of a man's true self, a self, that by suggestions, was held in the clutches of moral codes utterly at variance with his character. Can utopians expect much assistance from that class? It depends. Most men at that age care only for themselves, and if their social instincts are still strong enough to prompt them to do something socially, their minds usually turns to the creation of museums, mausoleums and monuments. Dwelling on these and other depressing affairs, they die. If they turned their minds and energies toward utopias divorces, or a youthful feature like lovers' lane, a new lease of life would be given them, for is it not written that old men shall have dreams and that they shall renew their strength.

To make divorces respectable, would help us to realize that marriage is only an episode in a human life, that it is not the aim and end of all existence, but that our true existence as individuals, lies beyond marriage. Let us suppose, for example, that a woman's lifetime is one hundred years, and since many have reached that age, there is nothing exaggerated in that supposition, then let us give twenty years for childhood and youth, and twenty more for marriage, now the question arises: What shall a woman do during the remaining sixty years of her life? Live for her children? But the children more often want to be left alone. A better way, it seems to us, it would be for women at this age, to enter into the larger activities of the larger home, the heart of the country. And there

are great opportunities here. Take the saloon, for example, by woman it might be converted into a salon or a people's court.

THE SALOON

To have a free and open court like the saloon, where all kinds of people can meet and mingle is essential to the growth of utopianism, and the social spirit on which it depends. The saloon thrives in spite of persecution, which proves that it fills a social want. At present perhaps it is a rank growth, but by applying the science of grafting it can be cultivated and changed, as we in other growths can graft twigs of apple trees, grape vines and cherry trees, and of the fruits thus produced, make various kinds of drinks, like cider, wine and cocktails.

Even as it is, the saloon compares favorably with the exclusive clubs, both in tone and in cleanliness. The latter, almost invariably, sinks down into a rut where games are the only entertainment, and sport the only topic of conversation. In a club, we are caught as in an eddy that keeps us out of touch with humanity at large, but the saloon is democratic, it is in fact the only place left where men from different walks of life can meet on the basis of equality.

But we are not interested in defending the saloon as it is. How to make something out of it that shall make it fill the function of a court, that is the question.

The first step toward that end, should be, that the saloon business shall be conducted by the county. Of all industries and functions, the preparation and serving of drinks is the simplest, and, at the same time, the most profitable. If a county wants to go into any kind of business, the liquor business is the business where success is assured. To this will be objected that this scheme has been tried and proved a failure. But it failed because it was conducted as a reform measure, calculated to make men more sober. But that is not the aim and object of a saloon. It can not be, and any business must fail if it tries to reform instead of pleasing its customers.

By the way, if we inquire into the motives of many reformers, it seems to be an unconscious effort on the part of parasites to free themselves from the killing conviction that it is their own presence that makes individuals in the body politic grow poor, violent, feverish and thirsty, and give to the symptom, our present saloon, the blame.

The next step should be to let women manage the whole liquor traffic, including breweries and distilleries for their own benefit. This is utopian, although nothing new. It was woman's function from time immemorial to prepare and serve the drinks.

The strongest, the only valid argument against the saloon, is that laboring men spend their money in the saloon instead of supporting their families. But when women runs the saloon for their own benefit, they, like the saloon-keepers, would soon realize that the spendthrifts were their best friends.

The county, through the women getting the whole benefit of the liquor traffic, would create a fund from which women and children could be provided when the husband and father had become a drunkard, and what does it matter if families get their support indirectly through the saloons. Spendthriftism is a great force. It makes men work hard and do lots of things they otherwise would not do in order to get money, anticipating the pleasure of spending it on women and for drinks.

Private or intelligent utopias, where everything is free, and where consequently the pleasure of spending money cannot be indulged in, can only appeal to a few and these few, most likely, would visit the composite utopias occasionally to get that pleasure.

Sensible woman should not antagonize this force but use it for their own benefit and prevent the profit from going to private parties.

The first change in regard to the saloon, we should expect from woman management at them would probably be a change of name from saloon to salon as more fitting to its new character.

Right here it is well to consider, that while it is well that men and women shall meet on equal terms in all places, their appetites and functions are different. Women who think that the principle of equality between men and women cannot be established and maintained without women indulging in the habits or vices of men, smoking, drinking, etc., or by men adopting womanly ways are surely mistaken.

Men seem to have a natural craving for stimulants, which the woman has not. Perhaps man himself acts on woman as a stimulating influence, doing away with the need of any other.

The saloon, under the new name, salon, no doubt would acquire some of the characteristics of the salons once presided over by great and brilliant women in Paris and other capitals. These salons exerted an influence strong enough to affect the fates of empires. Our humble beer saloon, by the way, is not without influence in the political field, and it rests with women to convert the saloon into a court, wielding its power for weal or woe.

Places of amusement, foremost among these, the theatre, are natural adjuncts to a court. It is claimed that the drama is the most democratic of all the fine arts, and many features of the

theatre can be sited to justify that claim. In the auditorium, the crowd is seated as in the interior of a vast cranium, watching the asbestos curtain. It rises and the play begins. And is not the stage the organ of a social or collective imagination? And the crowd sits in judgment over the play and players which is distinctively democratic, and the opposite of what takes place when society is under the sway of an autocracy or an aristocracy of any kind.

An audience, representing the majority, is, as a rule, hostile to new ideas. The theatre is, therefore, a conservative influence upholding old and eternal ideals as in tragedy and melodrama. But in its highest form, pure comedy, the theatre is not only a conservative, but decidedly, a destructive influence. Laughter is killing, but let us not on that account deem the theatre an evil influence. While it occasionally may ridicule, and make impossible for the time being, the acceptance of a new idea that deserves a better fate, its power to kill with laughter many outgrown faiths and customs and many fads and follies that are taken altogether too seriously, is extremely beneficent and shall tend to keep utopias sane and sound.

As a house cleaning is occasionally needed, and as we clear the ground in spring and fall and burn the rubbish, so a genius may gather the rotten limbs from the tree of life, and in the form of a comedy put in on the stage where it shall be consumed under a bon-fire of laughter.

As it is possible to picture on the stage the individual and social life of past ages, like dances, songs and religious rites, so it should be possible for poets and seers to present on the stage their visions of the future, the theatre would then fill a prophetic function. The movies comes to our mind in this connection and it is worth noting that the atmosphere in the movie play-houses already is distinctively religious, dark and silent as the catacombs. The managers at these play-houses, soon perceived that the trembling tones of a church organ was the only fit accompaniment to the dream-pictures. It is the subconscious or purely instinctive life which is here presented, while comedy is a play of the intellect, that for the time being lifts us to eleusium, where we can dwell for a moment in the realm of laughter, forgetful of all our troubles.

In rural districts, that is, in counties not containing any great towns, and far from the great cities, the theatre could be the center of attraction and of the greatest importance. Its maintenance, in most instances, is no objection to its establishment. When crops

were good and the industries flourished within a county, even Grand Opera, a 'corps de ballet' and a symphony orchestra, is within its means.

An ideal commonwealth, as such, must offer opportunities for the development of the most various talent, otherwise, it is not ideal. But there is a more vital reason why not only the theatre but all arts should be cultivated by utopians. They who live to please must please to live, and if the artistic element is not taken care of, its influence shall not only be lost to us, but it shall be added to the strength of opposing forces.

It was the pretense, and not only the pretense, of Kings and nobles, to pose as the protectors of those who applied themselves to the fine arts. The church, too, allied itself with the artists, and, while assisting the artists to some extent, these individuals, factions, and institutions themselves, grew rich and powerful.

A court cultivating the sciences, the arts and philosophies, by giving aid and opportunities to those interested in such matters, shall have assumed the rôle of an aristocracy, and by so doing, made democracy triumphant.

NAMES AND TITLES

Names and titles in connection with the court, shall now be considered. As social beings we cannot escape titles. The most primitive group or herd must have at least one title, namely, for that of the leader. If he be called the king, or the boss, or the old man, what does it matter? It is only different titles for those who hold the same position. In our republic we necessarily have several titles: President, Governor, Mayor, Judge, Senator, Congressman, etc. The army and navy have their titles. Churches and fraternities likewise have titles. Universities confer their degrees, and sporting circles the title of champion. In the absence of titles, money becomes the only measurement of a man's worth.

Genuine titles are a spur to our ambition and as such a good thing. Only titles that are bought or inherited are an evil, an evil because they are counterfeit. Titles based on achievement satisfy a craving for distinction apart from birth or the possession on the part of the individual, and as such in full accord with the principles of the republic.

The declaration that we are born equal, was not directed against titles earned, not even against titles inherited, but against special privileges on account of birth. For there can be no ob-

jection to an inherited title, unless it gives an unfair advantage to its possessor, an advantage he may be ignoble enough to take advantage of.

The republic recognizes no titles apart from the offices and functions connected with it. But utopians are free to bestow their own titles in their own ways, like churches and fraternities, although their titles do not count in the eyes of the republic. Before its laws we are all equal.

King is the only title utopians, to begin with, need bestow upon any one, as the King would have the power to bestow other titles within his realm, to those who had earned it from an utopian point of view. But the powers of a court to set the fashion may bring about some changes both in naming of individuals and the titles of those holding the offices of the republic—titles by the way, is nothing but the clothing principle, to appear to better advantage, extended.

According to our ideas, women should retain their own name, regardless of marriage, and let us further suggest, that boys be named after and take the family name of the mother, if that name be retained, and the girls be named after the father. This according to the theory that the sex of a child is likely to be opposite that of the strongest one of the parents. If this be true, it is nothing but right that, when people multiply, the child should be named after the one who proved to be the dominating factor at the time of its conception.

Even if this theory is not true, there are other considerations that favor this arrangement. For instance, if a man's name could be perpetuated only through his daughter, it would tend to do away with the ugly sentiment that a girl baby is less welcome than a boy.

If women were to assume the priestly function of officiating at religious ceremonies and take the leading part in the performance of religious rites, the title of vestal or its equivalent must be bestowed upon that class. The name vestals for a sisterhood of that kind is not exactly what we want and other names come to our mind but none of them are quite satisfactory. Angels would be all right in times of peace and Valkyries in times of war, neither of them permanently. Sister is as good a name as any, and a sisterhood of the republic is what we want. But that name today would convey the idea that those sisters were to be something similar to Christian nuns and that is not our idea. The sisterhood we have in view, shall partake more of the character of the suffragettes, and at times be acting as furies.

Fairies as a name appeals to me, but to many that name would sound flippant, so we shall use the more dignified name, vestals, until something better turns up. And if a woman was given the executive branch of the government, the following changes recommend themselves: Instead of the President, the Grandmother of the Republic. Ex-President, Great grandmother. Instead of Governor of a State, just Mother. Mother of Indiana, for example; Governess would be misleading.

The leading lady of a county we shall name the matron. Matron does not appeal to us like the name mother, but it has this advantage, that it is already used in connection with many of the institutions of a county.

To the real mother, known to their children as "ma" or "mama," we shall give the title "Queen of the Bungalow." As to the boys and girls, prince and princess is the only proper title for the sons and for the daughters of a sovereign people. Example: If a boy's name was George and his mother's family name Jefferson and his home was in Lincoln County, Illinois, his full name and title would be Prince George Jefferson, of Lincoln, Ill., the county being considered the principality.

REMARKS

The appearance of a real king under modern conditions could not help but be highly stimulating, and therefore, a beneficent influence, although a constant danger to privileged classes and a menace to vested rights. And in this connection, it is worth remembering that the crafty Spartans killed every one of the lower classes in whom they detected the qualities of leadership. Among laboring classes today the danger of a character of this kind is rather that he shall be killed or made useless by his own class, so trained are we in obedience, and in the habit of being bossed and driven.

The court, as a rival of the church, should also be a stimulating influence, although there need not be any real antagonism between these two institutions, their aim in reality being the same, the cultivation of man. It is merely a matter of methods. The church is aiming at the spiritual, the purity of the heart, the salvation of the soul, etc., while the court shall emphasize the importance of the physical, the appearance, the form, and insist on good manners and the observance of polite usages. And any good book on etiquette is a better text book for moral training than the Bible or any book derived from it.

As we have common people, so shall we have common counties.

Others shall distinguish themselves in certain branches of industry. Others again shall be noted for their artistic temperament or their philosophical or scientific turn of mind, the common counties being more or less mixed.

Now some of the children born in a certain county might not have any natural inclination to follow the occupation or to cultivate the arts wherein that county is proficient. Such then could be transferred to, or be exchanged for children of other counties, and all receive the training their special talent required. Probably, as a rule, the young men would seek their fortune in other counties than their own, and the sons of a county that succeeded in raising the finest specimens of manhood would have the advantage over the less fortunate. The principles of the various counties would in this way be tried, and the best prevail.

The character of a county shall to a great extent be determined by the sex in majority. If the number of men were greatly in excess of women, we would have a male county, and, let us suggest that sometime it might be a good policy to choose a queen to fill the position of a king in such a county. If women were the most numerous, we would designate it a female county, and here, too, it might prove the best way, sometimes to have a man for leader, although the female element predominated.

According to sex, we could classify utopias as masculine, feminine and hermaphroditic, the latter, and perhaps most common, consisting of those where the male and female element were about evenly represented.

For counties of a unisexual type, exogamy should be the proper form of marriage. That is, members of such counties would meet for a season on neutral ground every year for the purpose of mating and marrying. After the season was over, the participants would return to their respective homes, and of the children resulting from such a marriage, the girls of course would remain with their mothers to be reared in the female counties, and the boys, after being taught to walk and to some extent to take care of themselves, would go to the home or the county of their fathers for further instructions.

What benefits the community at large shall derive from the establishment of courts, cannot be realized until they are in full operation. But if a county where something like a court existed, became more alive and prosperous than the counties where they had nothing of the sort, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that it would, this feature of our social life would be generally adapted, though modified to fit the local conditions. When dif-

ferent utopian ideas are formulated and obtainable, the most suitable plan could be selected.

The principles of an utopia based on a new, novel or original idea, could with the least risk be tried out in new or abandoned territory. With a sufficient number of members, all the inventions of civilization could be utilized, and what a group of determined men can do though separated from the great centers of population, was demonstrated by the Mormons when they built a beautiful and prosperous city in the midst of a desert.

Most utopian attempts must to begin with, fail. But to see an ideal commonwealth, be it only one, gradually created and the dreams of prophets and seers at last realized before our eyes, would be a spectacle more thrilling than any play ever presented on any stage either here or abroad.

Incidentally our interest and attention would be taken away from crimes, wars and religious strifes, and our souls saved from the hatred engendered, kept alive or cultivated by such activities.

MOVEMENTS

Humble are all beginnings, but a game is best when it is young. And a movement in the state of formation, can be most easily bent to our will and our ways. Moral: Come early.

All movements are good. "Perfect peace is death." Already Pascal knew that. Even the crazy movement of the crusaders to gain possession of an empty grave was good. Peter the Hermit did well. The crusades gave opportunities for adventure and opened up new ways to glory. Knighthood came into flower and the fame achieved by the foremost of the crusaders has shed a lustre on their names and been a benefit to their descendants for a thousand years.

There are upgoing and downgoing movements in nature, in social life, and in the affairs of individuals.

All living creatures are subject to this ebb and flow of their forces. The salmon swimming in the deep sea, when the creative forces grow strong within him, seeks the shore and the mouth of the swift-flowing rivers. Now begins his upward flight; and he grows game in that movement. Scaling rapid after rapid with reckless, daring leaps, he gains entrance into ever narrower waterways, ever swifter currents, way into the cool, clear, icy rivulets 'neath the snow-capped mountains.

At last his forces are spent and a change comes over him. He is seized by a longing for the sea. He turns and like Tolstoy after his conversion, he finds that what was the right side is the

left side. Now, as he passes the places where he made his most glorious stunts, he shall assume an air of superior wisdom and sadly shake his head.

It is so easy to go down. It goes of itself or as if we were led by the spirit. Everything seems so clear now in October, the water and the sky. More beautiful, too, in a way. On the banks of the river trees are standing, isolated or in clusters, clothed in all the deceptive colors of decay. Overhead, birds, that in the springtime struggled and fought, are peacefully flocked together, and we hear the beautiful song of brotherhood, the swan song of the spirit—and down the salmon go, down to the Pacific ocean.

There are exceptions. A wise salmon by sheer luck or accident, may gain entrance into the great stillness of a mountain lake and there at leisure explore the shores of the unknown. Some day perhaps, he shall look up into the wooly face of an innocent lamb—a lamb coming down to drink, and imagine: Up there is heaven, there's where the angels dwell. But if his vision had a longer and wider range, he would see on yonder mountain peak an eagle casting loving glances in the direction of that lamb, as much as to say: "I shall eat it some day," or he would perceive in the shrubbery the slinking form of a hungry wolf, thirsting for the blood of that lamb. The salmon himself is surrounded by dangers, and if he tarried too long, ice shall clog up the outlet to the sea and make him a prisoner in the great stillness. Some cold wintry night, while he is gazing at the dark sky above, ice shall steal like arrows over the surface of the water, extinguishing the stars one by one, and at last cover the lake completely. Snow shall fall thereon and leave him in utter darkness.

But though the upward flight may lead to nothing or worse than nothing, neither is there any salvation in the deep. Many monsters are there at home, imaginary and real monsters. To mention only a few: The sea serpent, the octopus, the shark.

Movement is our salvation. For there is a joy in chasing and a joy in running away and rest in movement, provided it is our movement. Rest implies that we have exerted ourselves, it should also imply that we are accumulating strength for a new movement, not that we are now at rest or dead forever.

When we temporarily cease from movement, we get time to think, and it is good to take time to think, especially to have some forethought before we start a movement of any kind. But most of our thoughts are really an afterthought. And this is our danger, that we shall be dominated by the thought of the down-going and the mood of the downgoing. Already at the outset,

children are in the Christian baptism by proxy, made to renounce the devil, the world and the flesh. But in condemning these, we also condemn the creator of the devil, the world and the flesh, and create a prejudice against life and the God of life.

"I don't care for the circus, why then should there be any circus?" This expresses the sentiments of most of the downgoing and reveals their boundless egotism: Let the world die with me.

Better it would be if we like the angels the shepherd boy saw in his dream, went up and down on the stepladder set from earth to heaven serenely. And we have many examples of men who went down serenely, satisfied with days, praising life, and thankful that they had lived. These are an inspiration to the upgoing, and shall carry them to greater heights.

Lest we be deceived, let us always bear in mind that the world is forever young.

This is the morning of time.

THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY

In order to effect a social readjustment, we must lay our hands, so to speak, on the forces of superstition or the religious force, if you prefer, and master it. It has been known, this force, from time immemorial. More often it has been used to keep people in bondage through fear. It is used for that purpose today. On the other hand, it has often proved to be the only power strong enough to help men break through the barriers of established customs.

We realize it is a dangerous force to "monkey" with, and, in trying to give it a direction favorable to our purposes, it may recoil upon ourselves. But so is electricity a dangerous force, and many have lost their lives experimenting with it. However, because of these experiments, many of the ways and properties of electricity are known to us. It is under intelligent control, and it can be utilized.

The phase of the religious force we shall emphasize and endeavor to use, is the spirit of prophecy. And this is our attitude toward the spirit of prophecy: When something good is prophesied, like a jubilee or a millennium, then it is our plain duty and our delight to work for the fulfillment of such prophecies, and when opportunities presents themselves, we shall make the events come to pass without waiting for the aid of any outside agency. Thereby, the faith of those who have any shall be strengthened, and if we have none, we shall still have our share in the benefits derived

therefrom. On the other hand, if something evil is prophesied, we shall either take it for granted that the prophets prophesied under a misunderstanding, that they were angry, or that God had put into them a lying spirit. We have a right to assume this latter, as we read in the Bible that God put into the mouths of the prophets a lying spirit once, probably more than once. Thirdly, and this is the most proper attitude—to take heed of the prophecies of evil, and change our conduct so as to prevent the event from coming to pass. The story of the prophet, Jonah, shows that it can be done, "And God saw their work, that they turned from their evil way, and God repented of the evil that He had said He would do unto them, and He did it not."

The spirit of prophecy gave to the Jews a future. Their past was nothing to brag about, and it will be observed that the theory of evolution places humanity at large in the same position.

Polytheism, being a sort of ancestor worship, glorified the past. This attitude tended to bring about stagnation, in fact, stagnation was the social ideal of all ancient utopians. Confucius, Lycurgus, Solon, Moses and others, bent all their energies toward the establishment of commonwealths regulated by unchangeable laws. In the new testament we also discern an attempt to close the future and eternally stand pat. The outcome of that document, the Catholic church, is an extreme standpatter, and her children, the Protestant churches take after their mother in that respect.

So long as a prophecy remains unfulfilled, there is life and hope, but with the fulfillment of a prophecy, the religion or movement that has its origin and life in that prophecy comes to an end. The Jews became a sterilized, a fixed type, with the appearance of the hoped for Messiah. So the Christian religion and movement must stagnate or come to an end with the second coming of Christ.

While the fulfillment of prophecies to begin with, must be our main concern in regard to religion, it is important, in order to maintain our expectant look toward the future, that new prophecies, calculated to kindle some hopes in the hearts of men, shall be made. And if we, like the national fortune tellers of Israel, prophecy much, some of it is bound to come true, and if we are so disposed, but very little is needed to confirm our faith in a glorious future.

Although the ancient nations glorified the past and were not progressive, in the sense we understand progress, the spirit of prophecy was not absent among them. It was even a religious duty to consult the oracles before undertaking an enterprise of any

magnitude. So we see Lycurgus, a man singularly free from superstitions, found it necessary, in order to strengthen his authority, to consult the oracle at Delphi.

Skeptics, there are always skeptics, hinted that by bribery you could get any answer you wanted from the oracles. Undoubtedly the oracles wanted to please. And if we consult fortune tellers and mediums in our days, we shall be surprised at their ability to divine our secret wishes.

Silent is now the oracle at Delphi, but in the Bible we have an oracle that answers our purpose as well. The answers of the oracles were ambiguous. Everybody could read what meaning he pleased into them. Similarly everybody can read what meaning he pleases into the Bible. This has been done, and is done with great success by religious bodies, and we shall avail ourselves of the same liberty and in this feel assured that we are just as infallible as any other, be it an individual or an institution.

The unfulfilled prophecy, the second coming of Christ, shall form our connection with the older religious systems. Grafting our ideas in Judaism shall put us in touch with the spiritual force of that movement and bring continuity in the religious development. It is in fact, the only religious force available for our purposes, for we take it that Judaism is the root and Christianity and Islam are branches on the same tree, and that their sap shall be absorbed by the utopians.

The second coming of Christ is closely connected, in fact, identical with the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. It is utopian. So, we perhaps, shall sometimes say of the Christians, that, although they, from the beginning, failed to establish that Kingdom, they nevertheless rendered humanity a great service by preserving the gospel containing that thought. It will be remembered that the church or rather the monasteries have rendered a similar service already, by preserving the writings of Greek and Roman philosophers, a service that made possible the renaissance movement, which resulted in our present civilization. But as the renaissance did not bring about anything like the Greek or Roman civilization, neither need we expect or fear, that by awakening an interest in the idea of a Kingdom of Heaven on earth, we shall realize anything like that idea as set forth in the gospels.

While the prophets of Israel gave to that people a future, they at the same time, inculcated in the minds of the members of that race a fixed idea of the coming Messiah, which prevented the Jews from taking advantage of the opportunities the appearance of the Nazarene offered. So also, the more or less fixed idea in the minds

of Christians in regard to Christ and his Kingdom, shall most likely prevent them from accepting him if he appeared in any other way than they expect. How many do expect him anyway? He tarries so long, that if an event approaches with almost imperceptible speed, this saying is heard among the nations: "It is as slow as the second coming of Christ." If he does come at all, it shall be as a thief in the night—unexpected.

According to the gospel, He disappeared in the clouds and shall come back in the same way. But the great majority of mankind do not believe this. To them His disappearance in the clouds means only a disappearance under doubtful or suspicious circumstances, and His second coming no doubt, shall, by the same majority, be regarded in the same way.

He Himself said: "Lo, I am with you always until the end of the world." Now, since he is with us always, His second coming can only mean this, that we shall become conscious of His presence.

Christ always with us and always unknown to us is a highly poetic idea, and therefore, for our purposes of great value. It is an idea pervading fairy tales, myths and most religions, this, that gods walk the earth unknown to men, and that we at times entertain angels unawares.

If Christ's second coming shall be as His first, when, according to the gospel of John, the Word became flesh and dwelled among us, a moment's thought shall convince us that under modern conditions His life would become unbearable except His presence in the flesh remained unknown.

And only as a fraud could Christ be accepted today. If He Himself and His whereabouts could be determined, this fact would be wired over the world in the twinkling of an eye, and the consequence would be, that He would be flooded with letters and continually be called by long and short distance telephones. All who imagine that they love Jesus, would wish to see Him, and a great many more would come to Him merely out of idle curiosity. If He, in self-defense, should forbid them to come under penalty of damnation that would not save Him. What does this age and generation care for damnation? Why, many seekers for truth would cheerfully commit the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost, if they know what it was, as an experiment.

This is the greatness of our age and generation, this is. It is the greatness of any age that it produces men who have the courage, or be it only the foolhardiness, to take great chances. If we have nothing else to risk, let us gamble with our souls.

OUR TEMPLE

If we are told to discard a given faith and its forms, it is proper to ask: "What shall we put in its place?"

It is a legitimate question.

We shall, therefore, give the outlines of forms suitable for the reception of a new faith in harmony with our present knowledge, forms into which a new spirit is left free to enter.

In creating the forms, first, it will be observed, that we proceed intelligently like a machinist who first makes the electric motor and then turns on the current. It is indeed nature's way, first to create the form and then endow it with a consciousness suitable to that form. So Jehovah, true to the genius that created him, proceeded man-fashion, and formed an image of a man out of clay or dust and into that form breathed the spirit of life.

Life and the forms manifesting life are coexistent, and it is idle to speculate on which came first; more so, since both life and its forms more than likely have neither a beginning nor an end, but are eternal. But when we realize that the character of the spirit of life is identical with the form in which it appears, we shall be impressed with the importance of forms.

Forms we can lay our hands on and alter, even living forms, but the spirit that animates them is intangible.

Social forms we can create under favorable conditions if we have the spirit, and so long as we have the form, the spirit may enter at any moment, though it for a long time apparently had passed away. It is dormant in the form. For instance, so long as we keep the democratic form of government, the republic is, comparatively speaking, safe. For though the spirit of democracy be absent, or practically speaking, dead, it is liable to revive any moment. But when the form is lost, nothing short of a revolution shall again bring it about.

And so with the religious forms. So long as a cult can retain its form of worship, its observance rites and ritual, it is safe. If its spirit has been cowed, it can simply bide its time and awaken to show its true character when the spirit that opposed it has lost its force. That is provided that this opposing spirit fails to create its own forms of observances, rites and rituals and build monumental and enduring temples to protect these forms.

If we pour new wine into old bottles, it shall break the old bottles, and the new wine shall be spilled. But neither can we save the new wine from being spilled, unless we have new bottles wherein to keep it.

Before we go further, we shall again remind ourself, that according to the laws of the republic, we have religious freedom and that this implies that religion is separated from its affairs.

Utopians are not opposed to that principle, and in no ways dependent on a change in our laws in regard to this matter. In a composite utopia, for example, a private or intelligent utopia nearby or within the borders of a county, could render the utopian religious services required.

A separation of the affairs of the republic from the affairs of the religion, however, is almost impossible to maintain in practice. So we see public functions opened with prayers, and we have army chaplains, presumably, Christians. More menacing still, is the attempts of Protestants to have Bible reading introduced into the public schools, while the Catholic parochial schools are a bold encroachment on the republic's domain; the education of its children in the sciences and its principles. As suggested before, these religious bodies need a rival to hold them in check. So if the introduction of something similar to a state religion ever should become a vital question, utopians are in the field with their programs. The mere idea of such a possibility shall tend to curb these tendencies to force obsolete religious systems on an unwilling public.

We shall, therefore, in describing our temple, and giving some suggestion in regard to observances, rites and an utopian ritual of baptism, assume for the sake of illustration, that it is given for a composite utopia having adopted our religious views and ways, while in practice, a private utopia would fill that function.

After this digression, we shall go back to the temple, or *Heaven* as we shall prefer to call it. Though Heaven occasionally shall be used to give dignity to our utopian rites and rituals, it is primarily a house of prayer, a means of grace that shall help us to worship God in spirit and in truth. It is a symbol of the spiritual or inner world as the opposite to the physical or outer world represented by the court. The dependence of one upon the other of these two worlds is obvious. Without the inner, the outer world would be without a foundation, and without the outer, the inner world would be void. And this is the greatness and the significance of man, that he is the door that connects these two worlds, and that he is able to become conscious of both. Therefore, in creating a temple, as a visible sign of the spiritual world, and a court as the highest manifestation of the outer world, we shall impress upon our mind, man's greatness and significance, and facilitate his growth in greatness.

Our temple, besides being a house of prayer and a proper place for the performance of rites and rituals, should in its form symbolize our idea of God.

That form is Heaven.

Heaven as a symbol of Deity cannot be surpassed. Calm, beneficent, impartial, it embraces all creatures. Under its vaults is freedom, freedom for all. Jesus in His good moments had glimpses of that Heaven, as when He said: "He maketh His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and unjust," and when He lets the prodigal son on his return say: "Father, I have sinned against Heaven and against thee."

The Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingdom of God means the same thing in the gospels. Solomon's prayer at the dedication of his temple contains the same idea.

Among the Chinese, it will be remembered, the idea of a personal God is absent, and they translate God into Heaven. And it is worth noting that China is the only nation that has been able to assimilate the Jews. Jehovah, their tribal God, dissolved under their Heaven which seems to indicate that Heaven is a more perfect image of God than man.

Having decided on Heaven as our symbol of God, and that our temple shall express that idea, it follows that the main feature of these structures must be an image of Heaven, and the nearest we can come to that form is a perfect hemisphere or dome. This feature shall be common to all our temples, and shall give to our architecture a special stamp calculated to distinguish utopian cultures from others, like pyramids, temples and churches gave and give to other civilizations a special character.

The hemisphere, however, does not exclude great variations in style, both in the interior and the exterior of the temples.

They shall also admit of differences in the religious atmosphere, as the atmosphere in the homes within the same block in a city may be distinctively different. To comprehend this, we shall imagine a firmament spread out high above the gilded domes of the poorhouses and covering the entire county, and, though invisible, like clear bubbles resting on the surface of still waters, yet strong enough to resist outside influences to a degree that it shall be possible for a given county to develop and keep its own characteristics.

The temples may be erected separately, but also, and preferably, forming the upper store or dome of one of the most prominent county buildings, the courthouse or the county treasury for instance. The temples and treasuries were united in former days—or

in a private utopia the temple may be the upper part of the main dwelling.

The inside of this dome or hemisphere should be covered with the material most suitable for the reflection of slides and motion pictures.

In the center an altar or some object symbolizing the local or special spiritual aspiration of the community should be placed. Or several objects of that kind to be used at different occasions may be kept. Within or beneath this altar there should be a room for an operator to manipulate the slides and films, and from the center throw the pictures on the inner surface of this hemisphere. The inner circle of the floor should be slightly elevated like the inner part of a roulette table, and the outer circle inclining inward, giving it the appearance of an amphitheatre or circus. No doors, but openings at all sides leading out to a corridor or gallery surrounding the temple dome. The number of doors must vary with the size of the temple or Heaven, as we prefer to call it, but there ought to be four principal entrances located at the North, South, East and West sides. This location of the entrances according to the compass, is independent of the position of the building of which the temple may form a part, since it is separated from it by the corridor that surrounds it.

Inside the entrance and a little away from them, some objects, corresponding to the central piece, should be placed, so the illusion of being under an open sky shall not be broken. The absence of doors shall also tend to maintain and deepen the stillness, and to intensify the silence still more, it is essential that the floor of the outer circle be heavily carpeted.

Further, it is important that comfortable seats, meeting the preference of all kinds of people, without suggesting chairs and pews in schoolrooms, theatres and churches, should be provided. To illustrate: let us choose the burning rosebush, from out of which the Great God, I am, spoke to Moses, as the central symbol. Corresponding to this central piece, we would surround it with a stonehenge, consisting of twelve rough stones, suggesting the wilderness, to hide the openings or entrances. The chairs or lounges on the outer circle we would have covered with desert colored rugs, arranged in such a way that they would resemble the billowy sand-dunes in the "Garden of Allah"—a very poetic name for the desert.

On these rugs everybody could find a fold where he or she could rest comfortably like Lazarus in Abraham's bosom, or like children in the arms of Jesus.

As central symbols that may be chosen, we shall mention:

Yggdrasel, the tree of life, a lotus flower, the scapegoat, the lamb of God, the golden calf, the eagle and the serpent, a fountain or a well. These and others with fitting accessories shall give variety to the interiors of our temples.

Men early realized that it was a great advantage to have somebody or something to look up to as it tends to keep us erect and upright. So they placed kings upon thrones, idols upon altars, their temples in high places, and their God in Heaven above.

To maintain or rather to regain our upward gaze, we shall depend on the artist of the sky to create images of Heaven, the beauty of which shall compel us to look upward.

Landscape painters taught us to appreciate the beauty of natural scenery, even the rugged mountains and the barren plains. The artist's celestial, no doubt, shall teach us to appreciate the changing beauty of the sky even under its most forbidding aspects.

In our temples it shall be possible by mechanical means to give an exact image or an idealized view of the tropical, the Northern and the Southern sky, and the movement of Heavenly bodies, drifting clouds, migrating birds, and therefore, make our Heavens an educational feature of our social life. But as a house of prayer, where we can come to ourselves, discover ourselves and gain the strength to be true to ourselves, under all circumstances, a Heaven that creates in us a prayerful mood is the most perfect. Perhaps a panoramic view of a slumbering landscape under an evening sky shall best answer that purpose.

Music, even more than the aspect of the sky, dominates our moods and emotions, and we shall take it into our service as an art allied to painting, and prepare a room for an orchestra and instruments, like pianos and organs, underneath the altar, connected with Heaven either through openings at the base of the altar or openings in an intersection between the inner part and the outer circle of the floor as experiments shall prove to be the best.

"The Heavens are telling the glory of God." But what good does it do us if we do not hear it? But as we expect the celestial artist to open our eyes for the beauty of the sky so we shall expect the musicians to open our ears for a Heavenly music.

In darkness we listen most attentively—music is the art of night. Sometime we shall rest in Heaven and gaze into the starry depths of the universe with a reverence like that of the ancient astrologers and listen to the nocturnes of the players of that day, and hear at last the music of the spheres.

It will be observed that the construction of our temples easily admits of a new feature, namely, that it can be filled with rari-

fied and purified air. And this again gives opportunity for the practicing of the primary religious art of offering up a sweet incense to the gods. This art of perfuming the air, or the art of odorizing, as it might be called under utopianism, shall take the form of perfuming the air in perfect harmony with a given landscape or a given ceremony or religious rite. For example, if the panorama was presenting spring, the odor of apple blossoms would be in order; for summer, the scent of new-mown hay; for autumn, the smell of withered leaves, etc.

No doubt this feature would add greatly to the attractiveness of our temples. The gods in olden times used to gather like flies around the altars erected on the mountain tops, when they scented from afar the sweet odor of burnt offerings. So, to the counties prepared for them, blessed spirits would come to partake of their good things and with their presence bless the community.

A new Heaven requires a new hell. These two ideas are associated and cannot be separated. The old idea of hell is that it is a place of torment—eternal torment at that. To men of this generation, this idea of hell is revolting, and so they boldly assert that there is no hell. But hell must always exist as the opposite of Heaven, and so long as we have no conception of hell to take its place, the denial of the existence of hell, shall leave in our heart an aching void nothing but the old idea of that place can fill. Let us, therefore, give to hell a fixed location and a somewhat new character. But our idea of a new hell must necessarily retain some features of the old in order to fill its place. One of these ideas is that hell is located below us, that it forms an underworld. Another strong idea is that it is a place of torment. The old idea that a few saved souls shall sit in Heaven and enjoy the sight of the suffering souls of the majority in revolting even to some Christians, but without having something corresponding to this in our new hell, we shall, as said before, hardly be able to extricate our souls from the old belief. We shall, therefore, locate hell underneath the center-piece or altar, that is, we shall give to the music room the name *Inferno*. It has been noted that there is something demoniacal about great musicians, but what is more to the point, music itself sometimes sounds like the wailing and weeping of lost souls. And, as we shall know in Heaven that it is only the afflictions of tones, we can listen to it with equanimity.

Inferno, though in most instances located in an upper story of a building, shall form the basement of Heaven. But as this *Inferno* shall only occupy the center space of that basement, and

as it often shall be convenient to extend this basement to the limit of the temple, we shall offer a few suggestions in regard to the proper use of that space.

The region of the underworld adjoining Inferno, we would convert into a religious library and museum. The library to consist of the Bibles or sacred scripture of all ages including mythology and the principal fairy tales and works on folklore, also creeds, rituals and rites. Limited to works of that kind, any utopia could afford to have one. The museum part would consist of a collection of idols, altars, sacrificial knives, instruments of torture, holy vessels, charms, magic wands, etc.

It would ease the minds of many in a new Heaven to know that down in the basement were preserved the Bibles, the creeds, the rituals, and all the paraphernalia of worship, and that we could go back to the old ways any time we wanted to. To this, the middle region of the underworld, we shall give the name *Limbo*.

The outer circle of the underworld we would form into a gallery of religious art, containing statutes of gods and goddesses, and all the wonderful creation of myths and fairy tales and paintings depicting scenes from the strange life of these beings. As many of the stories of the gods and fairies are humorous, and the situations wherein they at times were placed, were comical, this art gallery shall lift the gloom pervading limbo. There is much in the Christian religion that shall evoke the laughter of our descendants, but we are not ripe for it yet. At the same time it would be well to prepare a place for the reception and preservation of the masterpieces of Christian art, in a time when the churches that now contain them shall be less numerous than they are today.

This part of the underworld we shall call *Chaos*, a name that shall distinguish it from the *celestial* gallery encircling the hemisphere.

Though we as yet see no temples on the "templed hills," it already makes our journeys on the railroads and interurban lines more interesting since we wonder as we pass, where temples could be located to the best advantage, and what style of architecture would fit in with the landscape.

OBSERVANCES

The first observance we shall recommend is this: In the corridor, everyone takes off his shoes or puts on some special slippers there to be found, before entering Heaven. An observance of that

kind shall impress upon the mind that this place is holy, the stillness of the temple shall not be broken, and it shall prevent the carpet from being soiled.

In regard to the observance of holidays, we shall offer a few suggestions.

In connection with the Christmas or New Year celebration, it would be well to revive a custom of our heathen ancestors. On that occasion, it was customary among them to make a solemn promise to perform a given task during the coming year, and it was considered a disgrace to meet again at the festive board without having fulfilled the pledge. New Year's resolutions to be sure, are nothing new among us, only our resolutions are more often a promise *not* to do certain things, while our ancestors took the more positive attitude and promised to do something.

The observance of a day of thanksgiving is agreeable to us, and in connection with that observance, we shall make a suggestion to utopians, namely, that a thanksgiving offering shall be received in the temple. It seems to be a problem for some, how to dispose of their fortune, and this offering would be a convenience whereby money could be restored to the public after it had become a burden to the possessor. It might also be a means of restoring the peace of mind of those who had come into possession of wealth by robbery, theft, fraud, etc. The best way, the only right way of course, is to give it back to those we have wronged, but this is not always possible. The next best way, it seems to us, would be to give it as a thanksgiving offering to private or public utopias. Through these avenues, some of it at least, would reach or be of benefit to those injured, and in doing this, a donor would feel absolved and could leave the temple with a free conscience and with the gladness in his heart innocence alone can give.

It is fitting that utopians should observe the Sabbath, or every seventh day, no matter which, as a day of rest. More especially since the Sabbath from the beginning until this day signifies cessation from labor, the original aim of the utopian movement. As we already have the Sabbath, we need not dwell on it here, but shall go on to discuss what we need but have not, namely, a year of jubilee.

According to the Mosaic order, every fiftieth year, we believe, was a year of jubilee. The interval is too long, every seventh year at least should be a year of jubilee.

While the jubilee itself, perhaps, shall not be all that we anticipate, but like the ordinary Sunday, shall often become tedious,

it shall break the monotony of life and give us something to look forward to. And it shall give the masses a chance to realize the difference between a free and playful life of leisure and an enforced idleness and all its worry.

As the Greek reckoned time in olympiads, so the life of an utopia could be measured by the number of jubilees it attained.

To let the jubilee be the closing year of an utopian administration, and let the administration be judged by that event or by what kind of a jubilee it put up should prove an incentive to action. During the jubilee, the inhabitants would have time to think and talk the matter over and make plans for the ensuing term, and could close the jubilee with the election and inauguration of a new administration.

The material part of this program presents no difficulties. To accumulate enough provisions to last for a year is a small matter, nor can we doubt that this idea would appeal to many, especially to the young. Nor would it seem strange. It would be like the preparation for a holiday or a long vacation. The boys would get ready their camping outfits, and the girls work on their jubilee gowns, while the older people would figure out what work could be dispensed with. The fields of course, would rest from cultivation, and all the factories stop operations, and all the stores close, but the cows, if kept, would have to be milked and all the domestic animals cared for, though even this work could be reduced considerably.

It is worth looking forward to. Its inauguration could be, and with the aid of utopianism and religious sentiment combined, would be, an event never to be forgotten. It would fill us with awe and exultation to see a prophecy fulfilled.

We shall hear bells ringing in the jubilee and gradually, factory whistles and all the infernal noises of industry and commerce shall die away, as subdued by a higher power. And all is quiet, so quiet that we shall hear the birds singing and hear the humming of insects. And while the bells chime on more triumphantly, we ourselves shall lift up our voices and sing in the great jubilee.

RITES AND RITUALS

The performance of rites and rituals in connection with the principal events in a man's career, like birth, death, marriage, divorce, etc., is of the greatest importance. It gives to the life of the humblest being a significance it otherwise would not have and it cultivates the social instincts.

A complete set of rituals undoubtedly would be an all sufficient

and ideal form wherein the principles of an utopia could be embodied. Performed on the most momentous occasions and embellished by the fine arts rituals are ideal means whereby the ideals of an utopia can be impressed upon the minds of the young and kept alive in their memory as they grow older.

Of the events to be solemnized with a ritual, we wish to call attention to the event of coming of age. Not the legal age but the age of puberty, generally speaking, around the age of graduating from the public schools.

Everything ought to be done to help children to pass safely through this critical period. Parents especially, seem to be unable to realize that their children are no longer children, but men and women at least in their own estimation.

A separation of parents and child during that time should be the best, but when this cannot take place, a solemn promise on the part of the parents that henceforth they shall treat their children as grown-ups, likewise on the part of the child coming of age, that from now on, it shall treat its parents with the same deference that we show strangers, would impress upon the minds of all concerned, the change that had taken place.

Boys especially, form many bad habits like chewing and smoking tobacco and drinking beer and brandy, all of which they do to convince themselves and others that they are men, not because they have a natural liking for these things.

We learn from "Private letters of Cicero," that when his son was sixteen years of age, his father presented him with a toga as a sign that he was now a man. This seems to have been a custom among the Romans, a good custom. In our time under the reigning fashion in clothes, this means that when a boy was of age and put on long pants, he should be treated as a man and not imposed upon any more.

As the observance of rites and rituals shall be the outward sign of an utopias character, signs whereby we shall be able to distinguish one from another, and as we imagine our utopias to be many and different, it would be premature or out of order at present to submit a complete set of rituals for a given utopia, as such a set of rituals to some extent might hamper and in some instances, perhaps, prevent the free creation of others.

But in all this diversity, it is desirable that utopians should have one ritual in common. For that purpose, we have written a complete ritual of baptism, which with slight alterations so as to conform to local or personal sentiments, may be agreed upon.

The naming of a child is really an initiatory ceremony. As

such, it suggests other ceremonies or rituals of initiation. These again of course must vary according to the character, aim or object of the different utopias. The initiatory ceremonies at the center of the composite utopias shall probably be very similar, the difference being only between the rituals for the initiation of different kinds of applicants, for the sentiments of a young man joining the center of a composite utopia for its educational advantages or to prepare himself for kingship, we imagine, would be very different from that of a retired farmer or merchant who might join an utopia of that kind for its social pleasures. Different from these again, would be the emotions of one who had gambled and lost in the game of life and at last, worn out by love and labor, took refuge at the center of an composite utopia. Substituting for "The House of the Lord" our new name for the poor-house, some of the psalms of David perhaps shall express his sentiments exactly:

I was glad when they said unto me, "Come, let us go into the Home of the Brave."

For a day in Thy courts is better than a thousand.

I had rather be a door-keeper in the Home of the Brave than to dwell in the tents of wickedness.

UTOPIAN RITUAL BAPTISM.

Under a somber sky, the people are assembled in Heaven. The King, the men and boys seated at the North side. The Matron, the women and girls, at the East Side. The singers and the guests at the South side. At the South entrance a Herald.

Martial introduction to "The Star Spangled Banner." Enter the Vestal and attendants from the West side (assembly arises.) She advances to her station opposite the Matron. At her right side a youth with the national flag, at her left side a maiden with a book of records.

SONG BY THE ASSEMBLY

Oh, say, can you see, by the dawn's early light
What so proudly we hailed at the twilight's last gleaming.

Whose broad stripes and bright stars, thro' the perilous fight,
O'er the ramparts we watched, were so gallantly streaming!

And the rockets' red glare, the bombs bursting in air,
Gave proof thro' the night that our flag was still there.

CHORUS:

Oh, say, does that star-spangled banner still wave,
O'er the land of the free and the home of the brave?

After the song has been sung and all are seated, the king rises.

THE HERALD

Hear: the words of our King!

THE KING

"Where I am there is liberty.

"There is no sin and no sinners.

"We are perfect all together."

"Oh, my brethren, I consecrate you to be, and show unto you the way into a new nobility. Ye shall become pro-creators and breeders and sowers of the future."

"Not whence ye come be your honour in future, but whither ye go! Your will, and your foot that longeth to get beyond yourselves —be that your new honour!"

"Oh, my brethren, not backward shall your nobility gaze, but forward! Expelled ye shall be from all father's and forefather's lands!"

"*Your children's lands* ye shall love, (be this love your new nobility!) the land undiscovered in the remotest sea! For it I bid your sails seek and seek!"

After the king is seated the matron rises.

THE HERALD

Hear the words of our matron.

THE MATRON

Our love goes forward to the young, were it not so, life would cease. But in preparing a home for our children, we have also created a place of rest for ourselves. In caring for them, we shall lay up a treasure in Heaven for as we do unto them, they shall do unto us in days when we are helpless as they are helpless now in our home everlasting.

After the Matron is seated the Vestal rises.

THE HERALD

Hear the words of the Vestal of the Republic.

THE VESTAL

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are established

among men, deriving their just power from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

After the Vestal is seated a youth from among the singers rises.

THE HERALD

Hear the words of Him in whose name the children waiting shall be formally received into our home and placed under the protection of the Republic.

THE YOUTH

Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I shall give you rest.

And he that cometh to me shall I in no wise cast out.

Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not to enter, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven. And whosoever shall receive one little child in my name hath received me.

Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him and will sup with him, and he with me.

All are seated.

Silence for a while.

During this silence the gloomy aspects of Heaven is gradually changed into the likeness of a bright and beautiful April sky with a rainbow amidst the clouds and the air is perfumed with the scent of spring flowers.

~~The Assembly rises.~~

Song of Chorus afar off, coming nearer,
answered from above with chiming of bells.

Enter from the South the procession of those who carry the children to be baptized and their attendants. It is headed by a little child and a chorus of young boys and followed by a chorus of young girls. The procession proceeds slowly around the inner circle with the sun. Music in a minor key.

CHORUS OF BOYS

(As they pass the West side, *forte*):

Blest be thy going and coming,
Blest be thy laughter and song,
Now and forever and ever
Blest be thy going and coming
For thousands of years and a day.

CHORUS OF GIRLS

(As they pass the same side, *mezzo forte*):
I have come:—

Like a voice in the wilderness crying,

I was lost and have come to my own.

CHORUS OF BOYS

(As they pass the North side, *repeat*) :

Blest be thy going and coming
 Blest be thy laughter and song,
 Now and forever and ever
 Blest be thy going and coming
 For thousands of years and a day.

CHORUS OF GIRLS

(As they pass the same side, *repeat*) :

I have come:—
 Like a voice in the wilderness crying
 I was lost and have come to my own.

CHORUS OF BOYS

(As they pass the East side, *repeat*) :

Blest be thy going and coming,
 Blest be thy laughter and song,
 Now and forever and ever.
 Blest be thy going and coming,
 For thousands of years and a day.

CHORUS OF GIRLS

(Repeat as before) :

I have come!
 Like a voice in the wilderness crying—
 I was lost and have come to my own.

When the procession is opposite the Vestal it comes to a standstill, having formed itself into an open square or half circle. Children and attendants at the center facing the Vestal, (chairs may be provided for those who carry the children). Chorus boys to the Vestal's left, Chorus girls to her right, facing each other.

The Vestal rises and crosses over to the center unassisted.

CHORUS OF BOYS AND GIRLS

(chanting) :

In his name shall all generations be blest.

Ears have not heard, eyes have not seen, neither has it entered into the minds of men to conceive what God has prepared for those who wait for Him.

In his name shall all generations be blest.

THE VESTAL

At the center baptizing, shall with a bare hand pour water over the ~~bare~~ head of the child and while so doing shall say with full voice and accented pronunciation:

In the name Jesus, I baptize you —————— (giving to the child its name).
 the child its name).

THE MAIDEN

With the records shall then say:

____ (giving the name of the child) your name is written in the book of life, in the records of the republic, and in the memory of those present.

This is repeated until all the children are baptized.

(As the Vestal returns to her place)

SONG

(By the Assembly and Chorus):

Hail, Immanuel! God is with us,

One with man ere time begun,
That thy word hath truly spoken

It shall be beneath the sun.

Hail, Immanuel! God is with us,

Children of the spirit, free,
Heirs to all the kingdoms coming,
In communion with thee.

Hail, Immanuel! God is with us,

Thine the power and glory still,
And thy kingdom comes whenever
I shall speak the word: I will.

All are seated except the Vestal who remains standing.

THE VESTAL

In the name of the republic I now declare these children duly baptized and entitled to all the rights and privileges granted by the constitution of the United States of America.

May they grow up and be a credit to their home and an honor to our country.

And let us pray that these children in the fullness of time shall receive the baptism of a purifying spirit, of which the baptism with water is but a symbol, and the Creator shall be glorified in them.

The procession now countermarches, the head taking the outer course passing the Herald. Music suggesting "Home, Sweet Home." It lines up before the Matron as formerly before the Vestal, only that the boys of the chorus are to the right and the girls to her left.

THE MATRON

Man as a social being must of necessity modify his conduct so as to make association possible. His modified conduct grows into customs, morals or codes of etiquette, more or less subject to change. With us it is customary on this occasion to present each child with a gift as a token of our love, and to the boys, to remind them in days to come that here they shall always be remembered.

No matter how far their adventurous spirit shall tempt them to roam, they cannot drift beyond our care. And to the girls we give this little key as a symbol of the responsibility that rests upon woman to preserve the race and everything that benefits man, physically, mentally, morally.

Bestowing the gifts upon the children with the assistance of the women in waiting, she shall say to each child:

_____ (giving the name of the child) you are welcome in our home.

SONG BY THE WOMEN

'Mid pleasures and palaces though we may roam,
Be it ever so humble there's no place like home;
A charm from the skies seems to hallow us there,
Which seek thro' the world, is ne'er met with elsewhere.
Home, home, sweet, sweet home,
Be it ever so humble, there's no place like home.

Procession passes on, same direction, music suggesting the Battle Hymn of the Republic, and lines up in front of the King as previously before the Vestal and the Matron, boys to his right and girls to his left.

THE KING

Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and it is our privilege to fit these children for the fray. Our children shall not want. We pledge ourselves to shield them from trouble in their tender years and to train them in youth to meet and overcome all adversities with a bold and fearless spirit and to bear misfortune with enduring patience so they at last shall become full-fledged members of our glorious company.

Our free gift to these little girls is to remind them of our love and regard for the opposite sex and that the love of liberty forbids that anyone should be enslaved or ruled over on account of love.

To each of the boys we give a little ax or hatchet, to remind them that they are radicals and the descendants of pioneers and that it shall be their chief pleasure to break new paths through the wilderness and make everything new. To create is the gladness of God, and as creators, we share in His gladness. But creation implies not only the construction of the new, but also the destruction of the old.

The axe is laid into the root of the trees, therefore, every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire.

The hatchet shall also remind them of the beautiful story about the boy George Washington and the cherry tree:—"I cannot tell a

lie.' Be that the only limitation of princes and truly characteristic of every King.

Bestowing the gift upon the children with the assistance of his attendants, the King shall say to each child:

_____ (giving the name of the child), Thou to thine own self be true.

SONG BY THE ASSEMBLY

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord;
He is tramping out the vintage where the grapes of wrath are stored;

He has loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword;
His truth is marching on.
Glory, glory, hallelujah!

The song leads into a joyous ceremonial dance by the choruses of boys and girls, while the children are carried away by their attendants, directly from the King's side, through the South entrance.

After the dance is over and the dancers have followed the children, the King shall address the audience in his own word, generally expressing an appreciation of women's work. Then a response from the Matron winding up with an invitation to the reception for the mothers immediately to follow.

SONG BY THE ASSEMBLY

My country tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty
Of thee we sing.
Land where our fathers died,
Land of our pilgrims pride,
From every mountain side,
Let freedom ring.

REMARKS

As the temple is an imitation of the open sky, the ceremony of baptism may be performed in open air.

Only one flag, Old Glory, preferably of silk, ought to be used. An over abundance of decorations with bunting often has a cheapening effect.

Special pennants for the other sides are permissible.

A tag or badge with the child's name to be plainly written or printed thereon should be fastened to the dresses of the children to be baptized.

In regard to special costumes for the occasion, we shall suggest that the little child that leads the procession be dressed as nearly like a cupid as possible and that the costumes of the choruses of boys and girls suggest Amor and Psyche. Special costumes for those who carry the children and their attendants, and likewise

costly robes for the Vestal and Matron and their attendants, are in order.

If the King, the Herald and the youth who carries the flag, and others of the male participants have costumes, these costumes should be masculine, no cloak or robes or anything that suggests women or priests.

A bunch of keys or one big key at the belt, should be the badge of office of the Matron. The little keys given the girls as a symbol of woman's function, may be made of gold or silver or any other precious or suitable material and vary in style.

The miniature axe or hatchet should be made of a material similiar to that of the keys.

The presents to the boys from the women and to the girls from the men, may consist of a little token of remembrance or of whatever they may find it in their hearts to give them.

No ceremonial dance should be attempted unless the choruses are properly trained to perform the dance.

Instead, a song combined with some simple, graceful movement might be introduced and we would suggest the following Christian hymn as suitable for the occasion:

My father is rich in houses and lands,
He holdeth the wealth of the world in his hands ;
Of rubies and diamonds, of silver and gold,
His coffers are full, He has riches untold.
I'm a child of a King, the child of a King,
With Jesus my Savior, I'm a child of a King.

More verses than the one quoted, from the various songs may be sung.

The plural form is used because we imagine that in most instances several children shall be baptized at the same time, but when only one boy or only one girl is baptized the ritual must of course be changed so as to fit the case.

In the book of records each child should be given one page, to be filled out with a description of each individual and a brief sketch of his or her career as the years pass by.

The first quotation in the King's first speech: "We are perfect altogether" is from Max Stirner's "The Ego and His Own."

The other quotations in the same speech are culled from Nietzches Zarathustra. (There is much of a ritualistic value in the writings of Nietzsche.)

THE HOLY COMMUNION

"Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.

"Again I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in Heaven.

"For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

This is the Holy Communion.

Here we have the essentials of a sacrament: First, its institution of a God-conscious man. Second, an inward grace is conferred, namely, the bread that comes out of Heaven as beautiful inspirations. Third, the presence of a veritable sign, in this instance, a crowd.

Into the sanctuary every one is free to enter, and with his or her presence in some measure determine the character or soul of the community, the same as our votes count in the outer world in the affairs of the republic.

The entrance into the Holy Communion is like a grub or larva going into the state of pupa or chrysalis. Obtaining perfect stillness and safely covered by the silk lined cocoon, the body of the larva, first becomes fluid and is then transformed into a winged insect perfectly fitted to cope with the conditions in the outer world. So in this Heaven under the influence of harmonious music and proper atmospheric conditions, our souls shall first become fluid and then be transformed into the likeness of angels. Full of life and with a dauntless spirit, we shall then be able to overcome all obstacles when we emerge from the temple to fulfill our missions, individually or collectively.

CLGSING PARAGRAPHS

A new spirit came into this world, the spirit of truth, but so far this spirit in most instances has affected our intellect only. Our souls have not been transformed. Pursued and pressed by the new light, we are seeking some hiding place where it is possible to believe and feel as before, acting as it seems on the ill advice "if your eye offend thee, pluck it out," but some time, when we least expect it, a new consciousness in harmony with our intellect shall steal into our being like a thief in the night. Perhaps some evening while standing on a lonely street corner waiting for a car to take us to the heart of the city. In such an idle moment, when

in a strange, lost and sensitive mood, when an unusual brilliancy of the sky compels us to gaze upward into the starry deep, Heaven shall be revealed to us as something tangible, as something so near us that we can touch with our hand, not seen, but felt like a nearness of mighty water, as if we stood in a warm room looking through a window and an invisible hand removed the panes and we felt the fresh air streaming in upon us. In such a moment, we shall become conscious of Heaven as a power, a power that we can use.

The mere thought that man possesses this power is thrilling, that by the fiat of his will he can compel changes, that by boldly writing across the sky: *So be it*, it shall come to pass.

Yes—and it might come to pass that some masterful fiend, coming in touch with that power, would take advantage of the situation and decree that henceforth, not the spirit of life and truth, but he himself personally, shall be all in all and the rest of us only the puppets of his will.

What then?

Well—what happens to one may happen to another. Let us be prepared, as we know not when our moment comes, and when it comes, it is our privilege to inscribe in the sky an antithesis and let there be war in Heaven.

BOOK II.

IDLE THOUGHTS

On the Moral Order of
the Universe

IDLE THOUGHTS

THE SHINING SURFACE

Earth is the floor of Heaven, reflecting the face of God. Consequently the upper or foremost part of all creatures is the most highly developed, and therefore, the most beautiful. All is good when looked at from above.

Perhaps the numerous forms of life here on earth are the counterparts of similar forms existing on the shining surface of heavenly bodies similar to our globe and connected with them through interstellar space. Again, all forms may be latent in the ether, and by the electric current set up by the great dynamo, the sun, they become visible to our eyes, when this current meets the resistance of air, earth and water. In any case on this surface, where life comes to a focus, the character of the creator can be studied to best advantage by earthly beings.

Though the living forms on this earth be the outcome of impressions received through the ether by rays and currents enforced by strong sun-batteries from similar forms on other planets, this shall in no way solve the problem of the origin of life. Most likely it is a spurious problem, as we know that there can be no beginning or end to time, and as we realize that space must be boundless, although we cannot comprehend time and space, so we shall assume that life is eternal, although it be beyond our comprehension.

As a manifestation of the eternal life, earth life is dignified. Our struggle to keep body and soul together is then the struggle of the eternal life and indicates that one without the other is next to nothing. That the question of the immortality of the soul must be forced upon us almost proves that we are immortal, that is, that we could not be lost, even though we tried. If there were any danger in that respect, we would have been safe guarded against such calamity. We are intensely made aware of any divergence from the narrow path that leads us to the maintenance and enjoyment of natural life, that is, as we take it to eternal life. As to any other life, we are dependent upon revelations only, and upon many revelations and many ways to salvation. If our life depended upon our faith in these revelations, the life that takes such infinite care for its preservation here on earth,

would have implanted in us a natural inclination for them, which it has not. It would not have left it to the accidents of our being born where the Vedas, the Bibles, the Korans, the Book of Mormons, or any other book teaching ways of salvation might happen to come within our reach. Further, these teachings fail to impress the mind to a degree that the belief in them becomes instinctive. They are like dreams. Babies are born bold and free, free from all the effects of revelation. Finally, life that cares so much for the grass in the field must have cared for its eternal maintenance. The life on the earth, which was once a gaseous nebula and at last shall be a dark, frozen mass if we accept that hypothesis, must have been provided with a means whereby it shall appear again, as it once did appear when conditions were favorable. The theory of evolution gives only an explanation of the development of life. It does not give a satisfactory account of the forms developed, where they come from, why there are so many of them, and why so different, and why they persist, though they are often encumbered with appendices that apparently are not a help but a hindrance in their fight for existence.

As to the *Moral Order of the Universe*. Perhaps this problem, like many others, shall prove to be a spurious problem. As a matter of fact, some of the bright men who have applied themselves to the solution of this problem, have come to the conclusion that there is no such thing as a moral order of the Universe. It is thinkable, however, that what these men were unconsciously seeking, was not the moral order of the Universe, but a justification of slavery. This, we infer to be the case when it is cited as a faint indication of such a moral order that certain ants keep what resemble slaves. But one who knew so little about the life on the farm, for instance, as we know about the life in an ant hill, would probably be at a loss to know who were the slaves and who the masters. Observing that the farmer worked early and late and much harder than the domestic animals, that he fed his horses and cattle, that he cleaned and bedded them and cared for them in every way, would most likely draw the conclusion that the farmer was the slave and the domestic animals the aristocracy, and when he saw the farmer butcher some hogs, he would infer that this was the riot and bloodshed following an unsuccessful strike for shorter hours on the part of the farmer.

The domestication of animals, and the institution of slavery, we assume, were not primarily intelligent or premeditated acts. When the gulf that separates man from the rest of the animals, was not so wide, the original types of sheep, cattle, horses, cats,

dogs, fowls, etc., kept close to human beings as to comparatively safe places, and gradually grew more tame. Likewise, the weaker or less aggressive members of the human family sought protection by keeping close to the stronger or more forceful individuals, and were at last enslaved by them. Protection leads to slavery.

Nowhere in nature do we find slavery. Slavery is *the sin*, the only sin and identical with the problem of evil which has given philosophers and the religions so much trouble and so long as slavery is essential for civilization or considered to be so, there can be no honesty in the discussion of religious and social questions.

Our failure to find a moral order in the Universe may also be ascribed to a lack of concentration. Our minds have been wandering away from the field where it may be found, diverted by revelations from on high and by the still small voice within. If we fix our attention on the shining surface and observe the living forms there playing the game of life, we shall perhaps be more successful, and though we keep on the surface of things, our investigations need not on that account be superficial.

In any case, speculation on this important subject shall give our minds some needed exercise in idle moments, and in this way repay our efforts. Like a man who goes fishing, if his ramblings on the lake shore or on the banks of the winding river gives him some recreation in the open air, though he catch no fish, his fishing has not been in vain.

Making man the measure of all things, trees and plants are standing on their heads, or with the end where the head should be, buried in the ground.

The vegetable kingdom reveals most perfectly the side of life called love, and its organs of generation, that is in the flowers, are developed to a wonderful degree. Stationary and without sense organs, members of that kingdom, necessarily are non-aggressive, and, as a rule, non-resistant. Exceptions to that rule are the species endowed with thorns like the thistle, and those that emit poisonous fluids when touched, like the nettle.

Animals are fallen plants, moving in the horizontal plan, head foremost. This makes that part of their anatomy the most prominent. Often it is adorned with horns, and always with sense organs, eyes, ears, etc. We note that while these organs developed, the organs most prominent in the vegetable kingdom diminished. We note also that their fallen position and subsequent movement in the horizontal plan necessarily brings them in collision with one another and makes them more or less aggressive. The

spirit of self-sacrifice is not in the animals, nor in the plants for that matter. Each and all are striving for themselves and in that striving are united.

So perfectly are these creatures organized or these machines made, that though they are most differently constituted, and though they prey upon one another, everything goes on harmoniously. One specie does not destroy the other. One should think the stronger the more ferocious, would do away with the weaker and gentler, but in so doing, they would in many cases destroy their supply of food, and what the weaker lack in strength, they make up for in fecundity. So perfect indeed are the living forms constituted, that when new conditions arise, useless organs disappear and new ones develop to help them in life to overcome death and as nearly as possible to be what they are as distinguished from other species. All living forms, however, seem to be so closely linked together that if one species by accident or otherwise should become extinct, it would probably in time grow out of the common stock of life from the forms most closely related to it, as a lobster when a limb is lost will grow a new one, that is, provided the extinct species was still essential for the well being of the whole and rooted in the universal life.

Man is distinguished from the animals by his upright position. He is a risen animal or converted plant. Therefore, neither the non-resistant attitude of plants or the aggressive attitude of animals is the proper moral attitude of man. While man retains the organs of love and the sense organs, in brains alone does he excel, and with brains alone has he gained dominion over all creatures. And as it is proper for any specie to cultivate its best point, and as brains is man's greatest asset, its development ought to be his main concern. Love should only be indulged in to the extent that it stimulates imagination and augments vitality. To that extent an ascetic moral ideal is to be commended. Likewise combativeness ought to be practiced only insofar as it strengthens our muscles and sharpens our wits.

Mans upright position, we shall infer, gave the creative forces on the rebound, following the bent of his body, a freer access to his brains and developed that organ to a degree that he became self-conscious, or rather we should say, by this occurrence, man was created. What happened then we shall more easily comprehend, if we invent an analogous occurrence. Suppose man should succeed in building an automobile that was really self-moving, that is, one that would run about of its own volition. Such an invention, would of course, be an achievement, but at the same time a terrible thing,

an insane thing, and, like God, after he had created human beings, repented it, man might, with good reason, regret that he ever brought autos into existence. As for the auto itself, it would soon find out that its freedom was limited and that it had to follow close to the tracks laid out by its creator. In meeting other vehicles, it would have to turn to the right, and besides that, take heed of the speed ordinance, otherwise its career as a self-moving machine would come to a speedy end.

For a long time, it was man's great conceit that all things were created for his special benefit. It still lingers, but a moments thought shall convince us that such is not the case. Consider the seeds of dandelions and Canadian thistles. They have down whereby they are carried through the air as lightly as spirits and scattered broadcast over all counties to the vexation of farmers, while the grains of wheat and rye are not thus endowed, must be carefully cultivated. This shows clearly that no forethought or special care to furnish us with food or drink is exerted.

And as it is with man in relation to the rest of living beings, so with each of them in relation to one another. Toadstools are not made for toads to sit upon, nor have we ever seen them thus occupied either for that matter.

Self-preservation is the first law of nature, so the saying is, and here we observe the recognition of a moral duty imposed on all living beings, and we shall, (shall because we must) assume that all beings have free will, that is, the ability out of two or several ways, to choose one, God, to use that word, in each enjoying his freedom and independence, for while this freedom and independence is immensely greater in man than in the lower forms of life, it is a difference of degree and not of kind. And as the lower forms of life are more true to themselves, more obedient to the natural laws of life, or less able to err than we are, their conduct to some extent, shall serve as a criterion of our own.

To begin with, one of the first moral obligations imposed upon the members of the earlier communities was to bury the dead. This was in conformity with the natural order. Countless animals die every day but rarely do we see any dead bodies lying around. They are quickly consumed by other animals and leave the surface of our globe fresh and fine.

On the same ground, namely, for appearances sake, it rests upon us, the moral obligation, to clothe the naked, especially the old and sickly. If a body is young and healthy, clothes do not count so much. The sight of a boy, though his face be dirty and

the bare skin shows through his rags, does not depress us. The healthy glow on his cheeks, his shining eyes and his white teeth, when he smiles to us from the gutter, is rather set off to better advantage under these conditions.

Vanity, the love of appreciation, the love to shine, the love of display we discern in nature, especially in the spring time when every plant puts forth its flower, its wedding garments, therefore, it behooves us, especially if we be rich or successful, even though we know that the success for which we are noted is a hollow mockery, to put on a gay appearance. Otherwise some perfectly worthless fool, when he beholds prominent citizens, shall turn Pharisee and say in his heart, "I thank thee, O God, that I am not like one of these."

To see the rich and successful clothed in ash-colored sack coats and with a care-worn countenance, kills ambition. And why do they appear that way? Out of consideration for the poor. The over-zealous servants of the rich are always admonishing their masters not to make any ostentatious display of wealth lest they awaken envy in the heart of the poor.

But why should not the poor be envious? Animals are envious. The ancient Greeks considered envy a virtue. It is a virtue if it awakens in us a desire to come into possession of that which we envy in others. If we desire a more equal distribution of wealth, for instance, we ought not to despise envy as a motive that shall bring it about. The preaching against envy only creates or intensifies class hatred. Many a poor man can read with interest and genuine appreciation the record of the achievements of successful and rich men, or could do so were it not for these insinuating servants. So also, we think the poor would prefer to see the rich display their wealth in their midst and in some measure lift the gloom, rather than to see them steal away to Europe or exclusive resorts for that purpose.

PARASITES

Parasites are common in nature, so common that many have come to think them necessary for the well-being of an organism.

Once I met a man who firmly believed that we could not exist were it not for the vermin. I advanced some arguments that seemed to contradict his statements, but he answered with the wistful smile of one who knows, "Don't you fool yourself. If you can't see them, they are under the skin, or hiding somewhere. Man cannot live without lice."

A conviction of that kind can only be created by long association, and perhaps we ought to respect a man for having strong convictions. Much can indeed be said in favor of such a belief. Nearly all animals support parasites. That they are needed in order to enjoy good health seems to be indicated by the fact that they will leave a sick or dying body like rats leaving a sinking ship, or like many of the French aristocracy who left their country before the impending revolution.

It is at least thinkable that parasites under certain conditions can keep people alive. A man without energy or vitality enough to keep his body and clothes clean runs the risk that the pores in his skin will be clogged up. Then appears the vermin. As incarnations of serving spirits and like tiny little pigs they will root and dig in the dirt and waste matter sticking to the skin. Thereby the pores are kept open and the higher organism saved. "O, the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God. How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out."

If a man, by long association, can come to the conclusion that parasites are necessary to his well-being, what must not the idea of parasites themselves be in regard to their own importance? Undoubtedly they imagine that the body which they infest is sustained by them and if they should be removed, they would feel like the king who looked back upon his lost realm and exclaimed, "What shall my poor people do without me?"

Though the parasites proper be only those creatures that live in or on a living organism, we shall, for the present, include in that class those that live in dead bodies or decayed matter. This class comprises a great number from the buzzard in the sky to the maggots in corpses. The necessity of these named, is easily seen. They are the grave-diggers and scavengers of nature. Before they are cold, the corpses are attacked and the material transmitted into new life. Now we perceive that the parasites proper are the forerunners, the advance guard, so to speak, of the army of scavengers that shall consume the body when life has left it. Nothing dead or half dead is permitted to exist except as a lawful prey for livelier though lower creatures. Only in this way can life be kept fresh and pure.

The organized bodies created by man must be governed by the same law as organisms in other kingdoms. If the body politic is not active, if its members or the branches of its institutions are permitted to languish, or if there exist no organs for the exercise of all the faculties possessed or required by a political

unit, then the community will be pestered with parasitical growths that will thrive, multiply and flourish until the organism in which they live and move and have their being, is destroyed.

Nothing, by the way, is more disgusting than to hear leading men of a political body, plead with parasites: Be reasonable, restrain yourself, have you no mercy?

And what good does it do? Nothing. A change of clothes, a bath—a new baptism—these are the proper means if we want to do away with them.

But nothing annoys and angers parasites so much as this that the political body stirs. It disturbs them; they lose confidence and think the world is coming to an end. Will they then perhaps change their policy? No. Everything that is stands pat. Especially parasites subscribe to the doctrine, "Whatever is, is right." And so it is, that parasites, being what they are, must sing the old soothing song: Be patient, be obedient, resist not evil, all is well with the world, do you not hear the rustling of wings? And the vampires fan the infected body with the cooling, noiseless web wings of a bat until the heart of the victim grows cold.

Parasites on the social body are of special interest to us, since they in a way, for themselves, at least, have solved the problem of living without labor, but let us from the start avoid the mistake of identifying parasites with the upper crust called "society." There are parasites in all strata of society, even among the middle classes, noted though they be for thrift and industry. By close examination, perhaps, we should find most of them there. Then at the bottom, we find hundreds of thousands of loafers, hoboes, tramps.

Contrary to the parasites, we have the animals that live on the surplus energy of others. An eagle, for example, does not require dead bodies like the buzzard, nor does it devitalize those upon which it preys. It kills and eats the lambs to be sure, but the sheep's power of reproduction is not disturbed. And so long as the game lasts, the presence of the eagle stimulates it into greater activity and a richer life. Sheep in their turn live on the surplus energy of plant life, but do not destroy it.

Man, by nature, is not a parasite, and as symbols on his banners, he has instinctively preferred animals and birds of prey. These are the royal banners. The priestly element seems to have a preference for the serpent. Moses, it will be remembered, raised up the serpent as a symbol.

The ancient astrologers made the ram the head sign of the zodiac, and there are many reasons why utopian kings should re-

store the ram to his rightful place at the head of the procession and choose him as their symbol. Especially because the ram is the natural defender of the lamb.

Like some animals, a man or a corporation of men, once self-supporting, may sink down to a parasitical existence, so also parasites of today may rise into life and activities that shall make them independent of charity or the necessity of living on others.

Capitalism or commercialism acts as a stimulating influence, and as such, must be classed with animals and birds of prey. But if it takes advantage of a weakened condition of the public at large, or even purposely creates conditions calculated to devitalize people by allowing fear of God, fear of hell, fear of panics, and other unhealthy influences to prey upon the great majority, they themselves sink down to the level of the buzzard or simple parasites.

Institutions for a higher education are a stimulating influence for those able to receive it, but if it is forced on people without any inclination or without any capacity for it, then it is a deadening influence for both them and for the community at large.

The same can be said of churches. They are a beneficial influence to some, and if confined to them alone, also a benefit to the social body as a whole. But if their more or less ascetic moral ideals are imposed on a majority temperamentally prevented from adopting them, the churches become a depressive, deadening influence, or as we would say, parasitical. Often, it must have occurred to many, that Christianity is but another name for another white plague. Both being both the cause and the symptom of a lowered vitality.

As a protest against the gospel of self-sacrifice and blood salvation, and the everlasting harping on hell, damnation and the general wickedness of this world, there rose spontaneously a number of cults who dared to assert the I. Christian Science declared that sin, sickness, and generally speaking, evil, was only a delusion of the mortal mind. Evil had no real existence. And many were and are healed by these cults.

But according to our way of looking at things, they, too, are parasites, because what brought them into existence and supports them to this day, is a lack of health in society or the individuals of which it is composed. Many leaders of these cults claim that they can also cure the disease called poverty, for poverty is a disease, as one of them wrote and very aptly added, "It is certainly not ease." And the truth of their claim is proved by their own prosperity. They have succeeded in making a connection with the

source of infinite supply. But in many cases, we perceive only too plainly that the source of infinite supply is only human misery. There is no mystery about it. It is from the same source which orthodox churches, too, derive their main support. By speaking words of comfort to those who suffer and by kindling a hope in the heart of the destitute, they are rewarded not only by the unfortunate themselves, but by others who are glad that such consolations are given.

Utopias of course shall put an end to this infinite supply, otherwise they are not utopias. This, again, must necessarily diminish greatly the number of those now engaged in cheering up and serving the devitalized, but not by any means destroy them utterly. But in utopia this class would be the result or outgrowth of a surplus energy, a sort of luxury. And members of that class might be cultivated and kept in the same spirit that we keep pet animals, because we love them, or for the amusement they give us, or merely for their winning ways, their fine plumage, etc.

Shall we then have parasites in the utopias? It can hardly be prevented. It is often impossible to tell who is who. Many a busy-body, in spite of his activity, does more harm than good, while the mere presence of another, apparently idle may be of great value to a community. In the utopias it is personality that counts. My character, what I am, not what I do or am capable of doing. Ideal communities depend on ideal men, that is, ideal for that community.

Dreamers of dreams are greatly handicapped in the struggle for existence. In extreme cases, they are incapacitated from making a livelihood. Their dreams prey upon their minds like parasites from a spiritual world, and they are, therefore, more to be pitied than to be blamed. And they are not always worthless and, therefore, worth saving. A dreamer who has invented a labor-saving device has brought forth a serving spirit that shall help feed and clothe a multitude. And one who has made a song and given it the wings of a beautiful melody has created an angel that shall give joy and consolation to wounded hearts in every clime.

POPULATION

Another difficulty confronts us by the fact that we have completely mastered the animal kingdom. For we cannot alter the fact that physically we developed as animals, and during that time, man, in common with the rest, had the inclination and ability to reproduce his kind to the extent that would make up for the loss

of life caused by the animals preying upon him. Overcoming his enemies did not eradicate his tendencies to increase his kind at the same rate as before, but as we cannot ignore and have not ignored the consequences following this altered situation, men have, from the beginning and up until now, willfully and deliberately limited the increase of the population.

The importation of rabbits into Australia has often been quoted as an example of what follows when a given order of things is altered. The natural enemies of that specie, there being absent, the rabbits grew so numerous that they became a pest. Man, by overcoming his natural enemies, is put in exactly the same position.

We of today, contrary to nature, care nothing for varieties or for the exceptional. We care nothing for Christ, still less for kings, and little for great men generally. We favor the increase of one class only, the laboring class. So intense is our desire for a population of that kind, that we cannot wait for its natural increase within our borders. During slave times, we hunted all over Africa for cheap labor, and no sooner was this traffic stopped, before, almost instinctively, the policy of a high protective tariff was adopted, and the slight increase of wages which this policy admitted stimulated immigration, and the desire for an abundance of labor was satisfied, for there was no tariff on immigrants.

Now this is nothing new. It is the same everlasting round, repeated over and over in Greece, in Rome and elsewhere. The upper classes die out and individuals from the lower classes take their place. And there is no reason why this should not continue. Labor is cheap only because it is abundant, not because the individuals composing it are unable to fill the places now occupied by other men. And there are no reasons why civilizations should not pass away, only that we as utopians want it our own way. Will that we shall get out of that rut, and our success shall depend on the intensity of our will and the strength of the will of our opponents, rather than on our reasons. We can always find reason for doing what we want to do.

Our will to do away with the laboring class necessarily implies the doing away with a class dependent on it. Our interest in the class struggle is at an end. Our interest is centered in this: What shall the utopians be like? They need to be different from one another since we need different utopias, and consequently, different kinds of people and it is against our interest that they should be the descendants of one class or one race.

Marriage freed from any consideration but mutual attraction

shall be most apt to bring forth desirable children, children that are able to meet all conditions and eternally perpetuate the human race on earth. But it takes all kinds of people to do that, and the problem is to find an artificial mode of selection true to the natural order. But the desire for and the dependence on the laboring class, prevents anything rational being done in this matter. I believe there is a law against it. Sufficient to know, however, that in the long run we get what we want. If we want utopians, we shall get utopians, whatever that may be, for it does not yet appear what we shall be.

We have the power and the freedom and all the time and all eternity, to make out of ourselves here on earth, whatever we want.

Without recommending any, we shall briefly enumerate the principal modes of artificial limitation of the population, which some time or other have been in vogue from the time of savagery up until now.

Greeks, Romans, Scandinavians, etc., in their state of barbarism, limited the population within the means of subsistence mostly, by putting the babies not wanted out in the woods to be consumed by wild animals. The Spartans tested also the strength or vitality of the new-born and the weaker ones were put to death. We are not familiar with this method, therefore, it seems inhuman to us, but to anyone not prejudiced in favor of cheap labor at any price, or the exploitation of children in fields or factories, the barbaric method of doing away with young children, suffers nothing in comparison. In fact, the modern method is more cruel, besides that it is cowardly, hypocritical and contemptible.

The worshippers of Moloch threw their first born into the embrace of a burning idol, which method must also be classed as barbaric though equally efficient. And let us remark in passing, if there be any truth in the theory that the first-born are deficient, as a rule, this custom made for the betterment of the race, and, further, that to connect this method of limiting the population with an act of worship, shows kindness rather than cruelty.

Abortions have been practiced from ancient times until now, and it is in no way an improvement on the barbaric method. It is apt to be more injurious to the mother, and gives no opportunity to any selection of a better class of babies, and therefore, detrimental to the improvement of the race. The most prevalent mode today, however, is the prevention of conception. The most common mode in this practice is to abstain from intercourse with the prospective

mother during her most vigorous period. The result is that what babies we get, as a rule, are accidental and conceived at the least favorable time and tends towards a devitalizing of humanity.

In this connection, we shall mention that our civil laws and the moral teachings of the prevailing religious system, the Jewish-Christian, not only stamp any artificial limitation of the population as a crime and a sin, but commend the increase of population. But this attitude of the civil authorities and Rabbi and priest does not prevent this crime or sin, but as the lower classes and the least enlightened, are more under the influence of religion than the more intellectual, it follows that the upper classes persistently commits suicide. But they got what they wanted most, servants and cheap labor, if death overtakes them before they leave any descendants, we must admit they get what they deserve, and no one shall mourn them.

The only mode of limitation of the increase of population we could recommend to utopians would be a modified moral code, emphasizing the beneficence of an ascetic life for a certain class of people. Since the only class of people to whom this kind of life appeals are those who are absorbed in work or play, be it physical, intellectual or artistic, and since this class is pre-eminently fitted for utopias, it is for utopians of the utmost importance, that this class, though ascetically inclined, shall propagate their kind, in short, be favored as fathers.

The celibate priesthood of the Catholic church here comes to our mind, and as this institution acts as a limitation of the population by the practice of an ascetic moral code by a certain class, the priests of that church, it is worth while to dwell for a moment on what its effects must be on the human race where it is in operation.

We shall assume, to begin with, that the boys selected for the priestly career, as a rule, constitute the finest, the most idealistic, or naturally the most spiritually minded element of the youths. These, then, are sacrificed in order that the poor in spirit shall live. Assuming again that the priesthood represents the better class, let the priests be the real fathers, and not the fathers in name only, and let the poor in spirit assume the rôle of St. Joseph, the foster father of Jesus and we would have a system favorable to the spiritualization of the race.

Such an arrangement would not seriously interfere with the practicing of an ascetic moral code by a presumably superior class, nor with the pleasures of love by those less spiritually inclined, but this is utopian in the sense that it is impossible to believe that men in our days would stand for this. Still such a practice

is not without precedent. In feudal times, the barons claimed as a right, the first night with the bride of their dependents and that they also claimed other nights we may safely assume. The barons had the might and the others had to submit. Assuming again that the barons represented the better, the most vigorous class, or at least, the physically most vigorous class, this custom could not help but tend toward the improvement of the race. And it would not, as we might at first suppose, create an antagonism between the upper and lower classes. On the contrary, it would bind them together with the strongest of all ties, the bonds of blood.

But here it is that the sword in the hands of the baron proved itself stronger than anything we can expect from the gentle art of persuasion. Even the religious force, though skillfully handled, we would expect to be powerless, though we have in the Bible a supreme argument in its favor, for strange to say, a triangular marriage is exemplified by the holy family and sanctified by the conduct of the Holy Ghost.

Any artificial limitation of the increase of population is more or less repulsive and there is a possibility that it shall decrease naturally to a desirable quantity when the artificial stimulations of its growth, created by our desire for servants is removed.

Anger, and especially fear, stimulates our imagination. In the midnight near graveyards and ruins, the children of our fancy come forth spontaneously. Ghosts and goblins increase in number in proportion to the intensity of our fear, and the same law is discernible in regard to the increase of physical beings. Animals that are preyed upon are the most prolific. The fear of the rabbit is proverbial, and so is its power of reproduction. So also the laboring classes are subject to many fears. The fear of panics, the fear of the future, and what is more to the point, the fear of getting more children. And it seems that this very fear begets them. On the other hand, animals of prey have fewer young ones, likewise people who are above the fear of want, and the fear of getting children. Sometimes they want them in vain. All of which indicates that there is a close relationship between fear and fecundity.

LOVE AFFAIRS

It appears that sex is a means of adaptation. The males, having more leisure, can venture far and wide into strange fields and meet with all kinds of adventures, and if many of them go under, it does not matter so much. But it is essential that they get acquainted with things as they are, gain experience and acquire

skill and power to master forces that be. To the degree, this mastery becomes instinctive and is transmitted to the offspring, it shall be a trifle less difficult for the specie to meet the ever-changing conditions of life.

There always has been, and is today, a large class of men perfectly adjusted to things as they are, perfectly satisfied with our marriage system and our social order, our mode of making a living and our religious ideals. They, who by character and temperament, belong to a more primitive state of affairs, are sometimes classed as criminals, while those who presumably might be better fit for a more complex or higher state of affairs in some cases, must be classed as inefficients or failures. It seems that life is prepared to meet any emergency. Should we fail to adjust ourselves to a higher condition and revert into barbarity, we are supplied with enough barbarians to maintain the race under that condition, and should a new and unknown order of association come into existence, there are individuals fit for that order also.

The most desirable fathers would be those who happen to be best fitted for a time to come, a time, the condition of which we cannot know. Consequently, it is contrary to the law of life to artificially favor any class of individuals. By selecting any of the existing types, and cultivating them exclusively, or prescribing beforehand, who shall enter into life, we may close the door for a coming Christ whom we do not know and of whose excellencies we cannot have a correct knowledge, until he is revealed to us in the flesh.

The breeding and cultivation of animals and plants for special purposes does not in all cases and in all respects bring about an improvement on the original stock, and when we consider the animals that cannot be tamed or domesticated but are held in captivity in zoological gardens, it is evident that they have degenerated. With greater success, is the cultivation of the vegetable kingdom carried on, from flower beds to landscape gardens, but although the effect produced is pleasing to man and not detrimental to the health and beauty of the trees and plants, neither can this be classed as an improvement. Trees and plants flourish in a wild state, and the wilderness has a mysterious charm, often lacking in a park.

In a work on occultism, the author of the same enlarged on the improvement brought about by culture and civilization and cited as an example of what good care and gentle treatment can do, the case of the Jersey cow. How gentle the expression in her face had become, and how docile and pliable she was in com-

parison with other breeds. But occultism has this in common with other cults, that it seeks to find a way to milk the Jersey cow, and we ought not to allow the love of milk to distort our judgment in this matter. I have never seen a wild cow, but imagine her movements to be more graceful and the expression in her face to be more, let us say "Spirituelle," more like that of a calf, for it is true what a poet once observed, that there is an expression of wide-awareness, or spirituality in the face of a young calf. What is the life of an animal bereft of its freedom and the joy of mating and making a living? It is the life of a parasite and a degenerate. What saves the parasites in the human society, is that they find substitutes for the natural enjoyments, hunting, fishing, sowing and gathering into storehouses, spinning, weaving, building, etc., in sport, gambling, etc. When our mode of making a living is not interesting, and we have neither the means or the inclinations for sport and fads, we degenerate. We are blotted out of the book of life and may just as well be dead.

That civilized man is any improvement on the savage and barbarian, has also been doubted, and when we consider the slums of the great cities, we are inclined to believe there are some reasons for that doubt, the smell of them or in them, is the same as that in the zoo.

We should despair of civilization and the blessings of culture, were it not for the life at court. Here everything is lovely and magnificent. The castle itself is grand, the furniture, the carpets and curtains, statues and paintings, everything combined convinces us that this is an improvement on the natural order. And the people at court move about with the freedom and grace of wild animals clothed in many colored garments of silk and velvet. Such is life at court, at least as we know it or as it is pictured in the movie theatres.

To sustain the life at the court and give it proper atmosphere, artists are needed, poets, philosophers, artisans, etc. This being the case, the importance of propagating or breeding a sufficient number of that class, presses itself upon us. But this problem presents peculiar difficulties, since the members of that freedom-loving tribe cannot be fully domesticated, and as husbands and fathers are apt to be utter failures. The courts, however, have greater opportunities for romances and is richer in possibilities for a satisfactory solution of this problem than any similar institution today, since it offers a home for their descendants and possible heirs to their genius.

In medieval times, wandering knights, minstrels, poets and

strolling players were welcome to the courts and a kindred class, the artisans, during that time, went from place to place, building and adorning castles and cathedrals. Utopianism shall give the class in question similar opportunities to show their genius and skill, and besides that, to satisfy their wanderlust, their craving for romances and thrilling experiences. And not the work of their genius, like statutes and marble halls, alone shall live after them, but living monuments moved by the same spirit, that made their fathers choose a life of love and adventure.

Of what account is this class today? Absorbed as we are in scientific and industrial pursuits, the answer to that question is apt to be: it is of no account. But all these to whom dreams are more real and of more importance than business, verily of such is the kingdom of heaven made. In their imagination it is; in them it changes; with them it appears, and with them it passes away.

We have observed that many children richly endowed by nature died young and wondered why. They started out full of life and joy. Their laughter, mingled with tears, thrilled us. Their voices, their movements were like music, their mere presence electrifying, but at the age of puberty, they broke down and died, while the dull and unimaginative survived to propagate their kind. It seems that under the present dispensation, we are in the clutches of an evil power, a jealous god who wills the corruption and the destruction of the fairest specimens of humanity in favor of the poor in spirit. Now it is all good and well that the poor in spirit shall be taken care of, but blessed shall they be who take thought of the needs of the rich in spirit also for among them gods shall grow up and reach maturity.

Speaking of love affairs, a little boy said to me once, "If my mother knew that I know what I know, she would give me a licking." And then he laughed. How can any intelligent child help but gain the legitimate or natural knowledge about love. They learn it in the garden chasing butterflies, and in the fields from grasshoppers, but by this knowledge the children are not bereft of their innocence. Now it is proposed that children shall, at the proper age, just previous to the age of puberty, be instructed in matters pertaining to sex, to save them from the vices prevalent in connection with that function. But how can we teach a child or anyone to avoid a vice without first informing it about the nature of that vice of which it perhaps was better that it was kept ignorant.

For people, as a rule, and young folks especially, look not so much for more information in these matters as for an opportunity

to practice what they already know. And what do they not know? We can't teach them anything. Newspapers are full of scandals, magazines are full of love stories, and in the movie theatre everything is visualized until the air is heavy with heart interest—they call it heart interest. How then can they help but know?

But neither shall that knowledge take away our innocence. To the pure, everything is pure, but with an atmosphere charged with love or sexuality, the chances are that we shall be contaminated. And what can the parents do to prevent it? Children resent the idea of sexuality in connection with their parents. They prefer to ignore it. And there is no reason why these matters should not be ignored between near related persons.

If we suppose a boy absolutely ignorant of sexual matters, all the information needed on this subject including the knowledge of vices and perversions, and the reasons why they should be avoided since they necessarily are injurious, could be given that boy in less than fifteen minutes and could be better given confidentially by a friend than by parents or teachers. Now it is proposed that this knowledge should be taught in the public schools, but that shall only tend to advertise vices and the traffic in sex. Publicity boosts any business. If this is not our aim, it does not pay to advertise. There is nothing to the sexual desires naturally expressed. But given the attractiveness of the forbidden fruit, and the allurements of a sin it is stimulated beyond control. Everything is done to excite the passions, and everything is done to prevent their gratification. Sexually starving, starving in the midst of plenty, as they say—many naturally go astray. And our social atmosphere has to be changed if the so-called social evil shall pass away.

The crimes committed in the name of love, can, in most cases be traced to the idea of ownership. This idea is not absent in the animal kingdom, but is, as a rule, limited to the mating season, and marriage confined to that season alone, we should call a natural or instinctive marriage. An extension of this idea and the different marriage systems and moral codes invented, are a more or less successful attempt at an intelligent control of the love forces. If evil results follow, they must be ascribed to an ignorance or lack of courage to act intelligently, and not to an inherent evil in our instincts. Animals are safely guided by instincts, but our instincts are stimulated by knowledge and intensified by imagination, and unless they are guided intelligently by a strong will, are apt to lead us astray.

Birds manage their love affairs most beautifully. In the spring-time they mate and build their nest, and a birdnest is beautiful in the spring time. Boys will climb the tall trees to get a glimpse at the sky blue eggs. After the young ones have grown up, the family tie is broken and the birds gather in great flocks, and no one cares to look at a bird nest in the fall. So a human home is attractive with children in it and dreary when they are gone. If we had a large and permanent home accommodating us as a flock, and smaller ones for temporary romances and marriages, we would have a similar arrangement of our love affairs.

But we have not succeeded in solving the marriage question so far, and the result is, that we can hardly pick up a newspaper without reading that some people have killed each other for love or have taken carbolic acid for love, or outraged themselves and others in a similar way, all for love.

Accidents of course will happen, no matter how perfect our love affairs shall be arranged. Accidents will happen even in nature. We are all familiar with the story of the two stags that got their antlers entangled and could not get apart. So they struggled on and on, vainly trying to get loose, with hatred in their eyes, each blaming the other for its horrible fate, while life around them bloomed in freedom and joy.

This is also the story of an unhappy marriage, and it is nothing but cruelty to tell the entangled that they must stick together till death do them part. It is more than cruel, it is fiendish, even if it is claimed that this sacrifice must be made in the interest of the community.

Were it not a work of angels to loose the chains that bind the mismatched, and is not society more safe for every cause of dis-harmony removed, for every discord stilled?

An unhappy marriage is an accident. So is a social order or moral code that requires that anyone must be unhappy an accident.

To carry on the marriage relation happily and successfully for any length of time is almost impossible, since men and women change as they grow older.

Some insects, the scientists tell us, in the first stage of maturity are males and function as males. Then a change takes place and they are transformed into females and perform the functions of the female. Something like this seems to take place with most men and women. In their youth they are intensely male or female, then a change takes place, and they acquire some of the characteristics of the opposite sex. This changes in many cases, must prove disastrous to a permanent marriage.

Man in his youth and early manhood, in the period when he is most male, will show a disposition to possess woman. He is apt to be jealous and on that account will treat his wife cruelly. His disposition is that of a master and he likes to hear his wife beg him for money in a whining voice, for then he most keenly realizes her dependence upon him.

But as he grows older this disposition is tempered, and if he by neglect, cruelty or coldness has killed or driven to divorce the bride of his youth and marries another, then he will lavish on her his fortune and the wealth of his affection. A similar transition takes place in the female. In her youth, dominated by her femininity, she will take a delight in an absolute surrender to her husband, a surrender that often awakens the tyrant in him, but after a while she grows more masculine and if she becomes a widow and marries again, the chances are that she will make her second husband a miserable henpeck.

But even to start with, a happy marriage, in most cases, must be considered a happy accident. Otto Weininger in his work "Sex and Character" has conclusively shown that the degree of male and female, in our make up is not restricted to the purely sexual function, but its influence determines our whole character. Consequently it is next to impossible that an even balancing of two individuals shall be perfect, in all respect. It is here that the incompatibility of temperaments comes in.

According to Weininger, there is no absolute man and no absolute woman. In woman there is more or less of the male element, and in man more or less of the female. If these elements are almost evenly present in an individual, we have the Hermaphrodite, or the man-woman type of humanity. This type is held in abhorrence by some people, but Weininger in common with some ancient philosophers is inclined to consider it a superior type. Hence, Hermaphrodites deserve our consideration.

Weininger says of the absolute woman, that she is nothing but sexuality, that she has no love for truth, that she has no moral sense, she is non-moral. And she has no soul and no desire for immortality. Now we shall have nothing to say against that, but in fairness and in truth and in justice, we must say that neither has an absolute man any soul or any morals as regards to intellectual honesty, neither do the absolute male care for the immortality of the soul. That Weininger did not become aware of this, is in our opinion a defect in his otherwise excellent work.

Then, an absolute man and an absolute woman would be alike in this, that they are absolutely dishonest, having no knowledge or love for the truth, and, therefore, non-moral and having no longing

for immortality. There would be only this fundamental difference between the two types: The absolute man would be a man of action and the absolute woman would be a woman of indolence. But since we are all of us more or less bi-sexual, there are no men absolutely active and no woman absolutely indolent. In the estimation of Weininger the man of action, be it as a general or a politician, or scientist, even, is inferior to the man of genius. But then it is hardly correct to say, as he does, that genius is the highest type of masculinity. Genius as the highest type of man, must, it seems to me, be bi-sexual, that is, neither excessively male or female, but a hermaphrodite.

It has indeed been said that all genius is hermaphroditic. It must necessarily be so since only the presence of the male and female element in the same individual can awaken the creative activity that gives birth to children of the brains, and the longing for and the consciousness of immortality. Necessarily, also, this is a higher type than mere male and female type, who, because they are dominated by only one element have no longing for immortality beyond that which we have in common with animals, namely, of propagating our kind on the physical plan. Higher, too, because they are a more perfect image of the creator of all things in whom both the male and female element necessarily must be present.

This view, it will be observed, agrees with that of Plato, and as it is expressed in the "Symposium" by Socrates in his panegyric of love. Plato, himself, undoubtedly belongs to this, the higher type. Nietzsche quotes Plato as having said that if there had not been so many beautiful youths in Athens, there would have been no Platonic philosophy. This, in Nietzsche's opinion, one must be a Greek in order to understand, well—or men of genius. And as we all are geniuses to some little extent, we can understand that being influenced to a certain extent by the female element in us, we shall to that extent be susceptible to the peculiar charms of boys and youths. In Greek, this cast of mind seems to have been common and gave birth to an idealizing and worshipping of male beauty, and this because they must have been more markedly bisexual than we are as a rule.

Hermaphroditism, however, is not confined to that time and place. Shakespeare wrote his sonnets inspired by a beautiful boy, did he not? And we may go further and infer that if there had not been so many beautiful boys playing the female rôles in the Globe theatre, there would have been no Shakespearean plays. A further indication that genius is associated with Hermaphroditism

is furnished by this, that men of genius, if they marry at all, (and they generally do not marry) often make a failure of it. Socrates neglected his Zantippe for philosophy. Shakespeare his wife for his plays. And so it goes.

MOTHERHOOD

The birth of a child is a mystery, the mystery of immortality. And a sense of immortality steals into the heart of lovers. Sooner or later a child that was not there before shall stand before them, and looking at its parents with questioning eyes, serious, mischievous, full of fun. This is like a miracle, and if we know absolutely nothing whatever about the process whereby the child is made visible, and someone told us how it happened, we would not believe it. And our first parents to begin with knew nothing. Naturally woman was the first to acquire knowledge. Motherhood was the painful awakening to that state. She protected her children as her property and enslaved them. Because of their love of their mothers and other women, men were enslaved and we had the matriarchate or the rule of the mother. At last the sons having acquired knowledge, rebelled and overthrew the rule of mothers and in turn enslaved woman. But still it lingers in the heart of woman, a longing to enslave men—a longing like that of our longing for a paradise lost. And women to this day love to watch men working, if they can do so unobserved, because it reminds them of those for them happy days when they were masters and men slaves.

FATHERHOOD

Motherhood was never a secret. Fatherhood on the contrary, had to be discovered. It is hard to prove even today. Though love affairs between men and women was recognized from the start primitive man failed to connect it with motherhood. They thought that when women came to a certain age, they gave birth to children. That man had anything to do with it, they did not at first understand.

What happened to the one who discovered the fatherhood of man we shall never know. The truth probably was doubted at first, then resented, then ridiculed, and finally accepted as something of no consequence. As a consequence, however, man in his own estimation at least, rose immensely. Now as a father, he insisted that the children were his. From this it was only a step more to claim the mother as his property and women were subjugated. This we shall suppose, made man happier. And that the

male element was given more prominence, we shall further suppose made man more aggressive, and in the struggle for the possession of women, children and other property more intelligent and further that this increased intelligence made possible his advances in other directions. But simply as father man is put in a precarious position, a position of doubt, and he is often made ridiculous on that account. His presence in the home, which originally was that of the mother and her children, we feel to be an anomaly, an intrusion on his part. Most fathers themselves, seem to feel the same way. At home they keep quiet, and often their silence is sullen. When out of the house, the fathers grow gay and at the same time the gloom is lifted from the home. The children begin to play. No wonder that the idea that we are strangers here on earth and that heaven is our true home sometimes takes possession of men's minds.

Evidently there is something wrong or lacking in our idea of fatherhood. The discovery was not complete. Let us therefore turn again to Weininger and give a few quotations from his "Sex and Character:"

—“Paternity is a diffused relation. Many instances, disputed by men of science, point to an influence not brought about directly by the reproductive cells.”

—“And also the motherly woman throughout her whole life, is impressed by lovers, by voices, by words, by inanimate things. All the influences that come to her she turns to the purpose of her being, to the shaping of her child, and the “actual” father has to share his paternity with perhaps other men and many other things.”

—“The woman is impregnated not only through the genital tract but through every fibre of her being. All life makes an impression on her and throws its image on her child. This universality in the purely physical sphere, is analogous to genius.”

Weininger is not the only one who believes that impressions other than those of the actual father has an influence on the mother, an influence that shall have its effect on the child. Races who worshipped beauty sought to surround the mother-to-be with beautiful objects in order to produce beautiful men and we feel that we ought to do the same. And in seeking a means to that end, it occurs to me that in the movies we already have a medium to impress the woman favorably for the offspring superior perhaps to any of the objects utilized by the ancients. It is as if pictures were made especially for that purpose. Love making, marriage and child birth is the main theme of the movie plays. The heroes and heroines are beautiful, their moral correct, that is, virtue is extolled, vice condemned, and when it comes to scenery, it is mag-

nificent. It is as if a kind providence had created these theatres as an escape from the ugly homes of the slums and not alone of the slums, into a world of beauty. Especially are they needed in our age when the public life, including the religious services do not appeal to the imagination and when they who can afford to do so dare not display their wealth in public for fear that it shall make the poor envious. Now this is already overcome to some extent by the movies, and much more can be expected from this field, and if there is anything in this theory of impression, and bearing in mind the many beautiful movie artists we confidently look forward to a new generation that in beauty shall surpass our own.

But by this diffused fatherhood, the actual father must lose in importance. Perhaps he shall disappear as husband and father and be what he was before fatherhood was discovered, namely, a lover. This again must profoundly affect our ideas of property. For why should I give my millions to a child to whom I am only partly father and withhold them from another child whose mother sometimes, and me, unawares, were so deeply impressed with my appearance that her child, though I am not its actual father, nevertheless takes more after me than my own and is therefore more truly my rightful heir. Indeed it seems that the only gentlemanly way should be to renounce fatherhood altogether and treat all children as our own and as equally entitled to our love and protection.

"And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your Father, which is in heaven."

BROTHERHOOD

If the brotherhood after the flesh is an indication of what the brotherhood of man shall be when it is realized we cannot expect very much from it. Already in childhood the older brother tries to run away from or boss his younger brother. On this account or for other causes, the sympathy between brothers seems to be very slight. Rarely do we see brothers together after they have grown up. They almost invariably prefer the company of others. If there be an heritage, the division of the same is sure to cause some misunderstandings. One perhaps went away and thinks he, on that account, ought to have more than an equal share. The other who stayed at home is equally convinced that this entitled him to more than the one who went away. And so it goes, brothers rarely agree. Be that on the account of the diffused fatherhood that necessarily brings about a difference in temperament or for other reasons. The Bible stories sustain this view of

brotherhood as exemplified in the brothers Cain and Abel, Esau and Jacob, the elder brother and the prodigal son.

The spirit within the fraternities, secret or benevolent, does not inspire us much. The only attempt at brotherhood in the modern world that appeals to us is the Big Brother movement, because it implies a closer union between the older and the younger and because we think such a union beneficial to both. A personal relation of that kind would enable the older to convey to the younger some of their acquired wisdom and the fresh view of life possessed by the younger should have a rejuvenating influence on the older.

Something like this existed in Sparta under the name of "Favoritism," as a few quotations from Plutarch's "Life of Lycurgus" shows, "At this age (12 years), the most distinguished among them became the favorite companions of the elder; and the old men attended more constantly their places of exercise, observing their trials of strength and wit, not slightly and in a cursory manner, but as their fathers, guardians and governors, so that there was neither time nor place where persons were wanting to instruct and chastise them."

"The adapters of favorites also shared both in the honors and disgrace of their boys, and one of them is said to have been mulcted by the magistrates because the boy whom he had taken into his affections let some ungenerous word or cry escape him as he was fighting. This love was so honorable and in so much esteem, that the virgins, too, had their lovers amongst the most virtuous matrons."

In Athens we find something similar to favoritism, something more hermaphroditic in the relation of men to boys as lovers and loves.

Plato in his "Republic" recommends that boys should be watched in their play in order to discover the natural bent of their minds and that they should be trained accordingly. This presupposes communism, and Plato's "Republic" was to be communistic. Where inequality of wealth exists, wealth more than the natural ability shall determine my vocation. A poor man's son shall get manual training and a rich man's son mental training, regardless of their natural ability or natural inclination. Plato's method interferes to some extent with the freedom of the individual to choose his career and change his occupation, and is to that extent autocratic, rather than democratic. In our republic, we hold that it is better to be free even if we choose the wrong path than that we be compelled to do the right thing against our will. In freedom a

carpenter's son, like Jesus, the Nazarene, may choose to be a King and a King's son like Peter the Great, may choose to be a carpenter.

The system of favoritism as it existed among the Athenians, namely, as a relation of lovers to their loves is of especial interest since it is foreign and repulsive to us, and more so since it may have contributed directly or indirectly towards the cultivation of the great men of that period. And a few quotations from Plato's "The Symposium" shall give us an idea of its nature:

—"In the first place, there were three kinds of human beings, not as at present, only two, male and female. But there was also a third common to both of these, the name only of which now remains, it has of itself disappeared. It was then (one) man-woman ('Hermaphrodite') whose form and name partook of and was common to both the male and female, but it is now nothing but a name, given by way of reproach."

—"They were terrible in force and aspirations and made an attempt against the gods."

It is then related that the gods cut them in two. "But such women as are sections of the female do not pay much attention to men, but turn themselves rather to woman, and from this race are the courtesans."

—"Such as are sections of the male form, follow the males, and whilst they are young, being fragments of men, they love men and are delighted in being with them, and they are the best of boys and youths, as being the most manly in their disposition. Yet some say indeed, they are shameless. But in this they say false, for it is not through shamelessness, but through assurance and a manly temper and a manly look that the embrace that resembles themselves and of this there is abundant proof. For when they are full grown, such alone turn out men as regards political affairs."

—"So in the case of loving, not every love is honorable and worthy to be highly praised. But that which impels to loving honorably. The one then belonging to the Vulgar Venus is a love truly vulgar." The other, belonging to the Celestial Venus, "and not sharing in the lust," must be the ideal. And hence they who are inspired by this love, turn themselves to the male, feeling for that which is naturally of greater strength and possesses more mind. And anyone would, in the boy love itself, discover those sincerely impelled by this passion."

—"But by those in Ionia and in many other places it is held to be dishonorable, for through their tyrannical governments this, and the love of wisdom and gymnastic exercises (are con-

sidered) disgraceful. For it is not, I conceive, to the interest of rulers that high thoughts should be engendered in their subjects nor strong friendships formed, nor societies in common; all of which those other things, and love especially, is wont to introduce."

Great men today, as a rule, are not lovers of boys. If their love is greater than that which can be gratified by women, their affection generally goes to animals, horses, dogs, cats, etc. And this is probably just as bad as we are apt to think that love was which existed between men and boys in Athens. For is it not more natural that I should feel an affection for the young of my own kind and sex than that I should kiss and caress dogs and cats?

At the same time, favoritism, as it was sometimes practiced in Athens, must appear as a blot on that brilliant period, and puts many of the philosophers, Plato included, in a less favorable light. We are tempted, too, to consider them as degenerates or a disreputable class of men. Nevertheless, we must admit that these men were the embodiment of what is immortal in the ancient civilization. As hermaphrodites, they possessed a surplus energy, for hermaphroditism is not a deficiency of male-ness, but an overflow thereof, transmuted into a degree of femaleness, and a consequent enlargement of consciousness. They were nature's favorites, richer in life and spirit than the rest, and they turned their attention to the cultivation of boys rich in life and spirit as themselves, and this may in some measure account for the great accomplishments of men in that age in the most varied fields of endeavor.

In our day, favoritism of any kind is frowned upon. A sense of justice prompts us to counteract the favoritism of nature by an equal care for all. But is not this, too, a favoritism? Anyway, it can be carried too far. While we, in the interest of the republic, must retain our compulsory public school education in the interests of the variously endowed boys, something similar to favoritism should be introduced. Something of that sort does exist in the schools of fine arts, where master and pupils are mutually interested in the same work. And it is no reason why it should not be in other arts and handicrafts and in other fields.

Here we observe that the natural father as a rule, is not a successful teacher of his own son, even if his son's inclination is towards his father's trade or profession, he prefers another teacher or instructor and resents even the friendly advice from his own father. The underlying cause for this is perhaps that the relationship between father and son, more often and from the beginning,

is felt to be that of master and slave. A friendly relation with another grown-up person, on the other hand, shall have a great liberating influence on the mind of a boy, especially if their interests are the same. And for the big brother to meet a boy whom he imagines to be just like himself when he was that age, would be just like meeting himself. And meeting his favorite, he would exclaim, "This is my son the beloved, in whom I am well pleased." This brotherhood is based on selfishness, the rock of our salvation, and this ideal brotherhood as my older self related to my younger self is also my ideal selfhood made continuous from generation to generation. And who could be in better position to guide my younger self than my older self. We all remember instances in our childhood when we were praised when we ought to have been blamed, and punished when we deserved a reward by those who did not know because they could not know.

The liberating effects an intimate friendship like that of a lover and his love would have on a boy or youth, especially if the lover was a great man, can easily be imagined. Now the great men are distant so long as they are alive, and deified when they are dead. This cannot help but have a crushing effect on the spirit of the young, who must feel that they can never attain to that perfection. It is the flaws in the works of the old masters that inspires us with a desire to try to excel them. It releases the dynamic forces within us. And as it is with their work, so it is in regard to their character. We love them for their faults and not for their perfections and love is dynamic. Some have praised this deification of dead heroes as a historical art, calculated to inspire the young. In reality it serves only to crush the spirit of every living genius. It is a black art practiced in the interest of reactionaries. *Their* men are idolized and are given a place on the front page, so to speak, in history, while men of genius, philosopher, scientist, artist, inventor, etc., if they are mentioned at all, are given a place in the margin or in a foot note. If the intention was to throw a mantle of charity over the faults of great men, we should have no objection to this historical art. But this is not the case, for when it comes to men of genius, their faults are not forgotten. Some indeed do not hesitate to class them all as degenerates.

In the powers of darkness, there is not a shadow of change. To kill and defame the Lucifers, the bringers of light, the innovators, is, and must be their business. While the friendship and close relationships with the great men of their time must have been a great help to the youths, we ought not to ascribe to that relationships more than it deserves. Previous to the great period

of Greek life in Crete first, and later in other places, the Greeks had discarded almost all their clothes and went about, practically speaking, naked. This innovation was at that time, by the barbarians, considered shameless, as it would today by Christians be considered a sign of degeneracy.

But the freeing of the body from a superfluous clothing may have had an equally liberating effect on their minds and under this new freedom, their bodies became more beautiful and their souls expanded. As a consequence they became worshippers of beauty, especially male beauty. This indicates that nudeness, instead of exciting their sexual passion, on the contrary, tended to lift the mind above it, and made them able to contemplate the human form dispassionately.

An excessive use of clothes and an undue concealment of the human form stimulates the imagination and the heart interest and ill health follows this all-absorbing heart interest. Nudeness seems to be a necessity. Eskimos were by the severity of the climate in the Arctic region, compelled to wear heavy clothing when they were hunting and fishing, but when they had come into their ice huts, they stripped off everything and sat on their polar bear rugs stark naked, but perfectly innocent, sinless and shameless, modest in movements and demeanor. That is, so they did in their original and healthful state, now they are converted and wear clothes, and are sick and dying out. So we observe in the Samoan Islands—to take an example from a tropical clime—in their original state, Samoans were naked and healthy, but as soon as they became Christians and wore Christian clothes, they got consumption. And there is no cure for it unless it be a universal application of Utopianism, which admits moral experiments, including a trial of nudeness. The only objection to a trial of that kind should be that our bodies are more or less deformed at present by the wearing of clothes. Fine feathers make fine birds. When their feathers are moulted, birds look bad. Somewhat similarly the face of a man the day after he has shaved off his whiskers appears angular and it wears a skeleton like grin. But after a few days the smile wears off and the features become more rounded out and consequently present a more pleasing sight. So we shall expect that when the surface of our bodies come in direct touch with the moulding forces of the universe, they shall be made more symmetrical and beautiful and a more fit habitation for our soul. To try this idea in Utopias should be a simple matter. With large homes connected with spacious heavens, properly ventilated and heated, a discarding of clothes within the homes is possible even in the winter time. What clothes and drap-

eries are retained would be purely ornamental. But since what little we had on would be to conceal and not to expose the effect would be pure as the motive is pure. Any exposure of the neck and shoulders, be it only an inch, if it is made as an advertisement of the bodily charms is vulgar, because it savors of a traffic in sex. Leaving the homes, climatic conditions shall compel people outside the tropical zone, as it did the Eskimos to put on suitable costumes as overalls for the different walks of life. Street and working clothes that could be easily stripped off and placed in the ante-rooms when we returned. In the heavens, at least, we should expect our costumes to be somewhat paradisical. From this revolutionizing of clothing would naturally and inevitably follow an increased vitality. In ecstasy and certain forms of insanity, which may be a temporary sense of an abundance of life, people have a desire to throw away clothes, together with the restraint of conventionality, having lost their sense of sin and shame and being filled with that perfect love that casteth out all fear. And filled with that abundance of life, we should be better able to understand the platonic love. "Friends should have everything in common." That is the burden of Plato's social philosophy. Everything including women and children—these being property in his days. The idea that men, women and children belong to themselves and all which this implies is scarcely realized today. We might say that unless we have everything in common, we cannot be friends. Then we are only brothers. Then we perceive that the Platonic idea of friendship is different from and superior to the idea of brotherhood in the same way that we recognize that intelligence is different from and superior to instinct. Though the latter is the stronger, the more fundamental of the two.

The time of Plato was the Greek pentecost. Apparently the more gifted Athenians during that great period had lost their moral sense. In them, then, the forces, inhibited by faith and ancient customs, found an outlet. Liberated and as in a state of intoxication they began to question the truth of myths and morals and discussed everything with an almost bacic fury.

A similar occurrence takes place in nature when they at other times well-behaved animals, the males especially, in the mating season begin to act strangely and wildly and in this period of irresponsibility propagate their kind. Similarly the great period in Greek life was a spiritual or mental mating season that gave birth to the immortal children of their brains—children, which being immortal, are still with us and have power to stimulate minds of a congenial quality.

Everything passes away. All civilizations and all dispensations come to an end but not all of them have a pentecost to wind up with. Our civilization comes to an end. Shall we hear the bells of pentecost chiming?

SISTERHOOD

We hear a great deal about the brotherhood of man, but never about the sisterhood of man. Our language is against it. While fraternity means brotherhood, maternity does not mean sisterhood. Our present era which is a continuation of the patriarchate, recognizes the mother to some extent, but has no room for the sister. But in woman's striving for the ballot, and organizing themselves into women's clubs, we see a sisterhood coming that shall take possession of the political and religious functions naturally belonging to woman. And as the matriarchate preceded the patriarchate, so we shall expect the sisterhood of man to come before the brotherhood of man. This, however, we do not expect to result in anything like the matriarchate or patriarchate, since both these forms were based on sex and are in their nature, autocratic.

Having risen to the recognition of the individual as the unit and freedom of the individual as the ideal, any return of the archaic forms is out of the question. History does not repeat itself. Should we return to Paradise, the original utopia, we should be wiser than the serpent, and it would be a better and safer Paradise for our having wandered away from that blessed garden. The first step towards democracy, it will be remembered, was taken by Eve. The Tree of Knowledge looked good to her, and she ate of the forbidden fruit. She knew it was wrong, but she took an apple anyway, and generously offered some of it to her partner, and the ever-obedient Adam ate thereof, and both knew good and evil. Now, what we shall expect of the sisters is, that they shall complete the work of Eve, and take the last step towards the establishment of a perfect democracy, or, to use the symbolic language of the Bible, that they take also of the tree of life, and we shall live forever.

No man can tell what his sisters will do or what his sisters are capable of doing, that must forever remain a mystery to us, but it is a safe guess that it shall not be the mother type of womanhood that shall come to the front during a coming sisterhood. The mother type has had its day. The sister will of course take care of the mothers, they generally do, and being in better position to do so, will see to it that the mothers are not neglected. The other type, the bi-sexual, corresponding to the male hermaphrodites,

the Sapphist type, so named after Sappho, which we expect to take the leadership in a coming sisterhood, is therefore, of special interest to us, and as Ibsen in "Hedda Gabler" has portrayed a modern woman character of that type, we shall dwell for a moment on her main features.

Hedda Gabler as a child was boyish, her playmates were afraid of her. When grown up she did not care for marriage, but drifted into it, and as a married woman, she loathed the very word love, "Faugh, don't use that slushy word." The mere thought of being big with child was abhorrent with Hedda. And in the bosom of the family, she, like so many of her kind, perished. Reaching the climax of her tragedy, she propounded this question—speaking as it were into the void—"Is there nothing I can do to help you two?" And her husband answered absent-mindedly as it were "Nothing in the world."

Hedda Gabler had nothing to do and did not know what to do, therefore, she had to die, and she did kill herself. In spite of that, she was, and by her associates were felt to be, a superior woman. But as a superior woman, she was under the obligation to assume the leadership and its responsibilities. Too lazy and too cowardly, she drifted. On every turn, she violated her own nature, consequently it did turn out disastrously for herself and others. For the mother type of woman, it is perfectly natural to marry and use their influences as an irresponsible power behind the throne. It is instinctively and therefore innocently done. When a woman has become conscious of her power and uses it without regards for others which this consciousness demands, that is, uses it as a woman, on the instinctive plan, the result must be disastrous, as the actions of an animal would be if it became conscious of its strength without any sense of responsibility as to its use.

Therefore this class of women should be put in positions of responsibility in larger units than the family for their own good and for the good of these larger units and for the good of the family. Hedda Gabler was interested in politics, but laboring under the delusion that she could play the part of the wife as the power behind the throne, she wished that her husband who was not fitted for it, would go into politics instead of entering the arena herself. All women, it is claimed, are at heart aristocratic, and the superior type, as represented by Hedda Gabler, is essentially so. Power, distinction and luxury was what she wanted through politics. This is an additional reason why women should be given functions in the political and religious bodies. They would put some style to it. And there would be no limit to their demands in order to aggrandize

the social forms entrusted in their care. They would, in their love of power, distinction and luxury, be a danger to our liberties, a danger that shall keep us alive to the danger of losing them, which again is a gain, since only through eternal vigilance can the spirit of liberty be kept alive.

The mother type cares nothing for politics as a rule. They love their husbands, their children, their homes, sometimes the church, but that's the limit. Their love is limited and they love too much. We are enslaved by love. As it is bluntly stated in Genesis, "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Now, husbands and wives do not object to this state of affairs, and no one should interfere so long as this desire to be ruled and the desire to rule does not exceed what to both is desirable. But as this desire to rule may lead to cruelty and neglect of the ruled one, it surely would be to the advantage of the mother, if there existed a sisterhood ready to protect them. A sisterhood, the mere existence of which would fill the hearts of men with a religious awe, a fear like that of a power, mysterious ominous, sinister.

However, we do not expect that a sisterhood among the daughters of woman shall result in anything like a sisterhood of nuns. But we do expect, and shall be prepared for almost anything else. This element of uncertainty shall add to the zest of life and the joy of living, and help to make peace as interesting as war.

What we hope for, among other things is, that the sisters shall succeed where the brothers have failed, namely, in freeing humanity from the bondage of the Vulgar Venus.

It is not so easy. Emancipation shall not be effected unless we are able to create social forms or introduce social customs suitable for the bi-sexual men and women and still retain the customs demanded by those who are not of that kind. A separation is impossible because from the marriage union of the uni-sexual has come and shall continue to come, the bi-sexual and children of the bi-sexual shall revert into the uni-sexual. It is this that makes the problem so difficult to solve. Many times humanity has risen to the border land of the Celestial Venus, but failed to build her a temple as a temporal abode, and the Vulgar Venus won out, and after a season of riotous living, humanity reverted into barbarism.

IDEALS

Since men and women are differently constituted, they have different ideals and can never fully agree. In this war between the sexes there may be rare moments of peace when lovers or those

who are only married are at peace in each other's presence, sitting quietly beside one another thinking of nothing. But presently one shall ask the other: "What are you thinking about now?" And the answer is: "Nothing." And before any of them knows how it happened, the war breaks out again.

This opposition of man and woman to each other is most strongly marked during the mating season, though never wholly absent. There are men who can never look at a woman without being aware of her sex, as there are women who recognize no other man than the man of the mating season. But in considering the different ideals of men and women, we shall bear in mind that these differences, being determined by sex, tend to disappear when that impulse grows weaker or comes under perfect control.

Woman's ideal man, to begin with, must be strong and brave. And nothing can convince her of that except that he overcomes herself in spite of her opposition. It pleases her to see a man go down on his knees before her, for this is not a sign of weakness, but a sign of strength of his passion and her own power. It is perfectly natural, too, for a strong man to kneel in order to look up to the girl he adores. That it is not customary in our days, is an indication of our weakness. We are all laboring men. Imagine a tired business man doing that stunt! It would be ridiculous. And ridiculous a woman's ideal man must not be. He must be serious, grand, exalted, in short, a super man. Nietzsche's Zarathustra is woman's ideal man.

Zarathustra puzzled me at first. With all his strange ways and sayings, there was something familiar about that man. Then at last it dawned upon me: Zarathustra is nothing but our old friend Jehovah modernized. There can be no mistake as to his identity. Great, terrible and alone. We might say the only one, for it would be hard to imagine that there should be several of that character. Zarathustra has disciples but no followers. His greatness is such that it excludes others. To this character Nietzsche gave all the attributes of Jehovah, and woman demands nothing less of an ideal man, and as creators of men, woman ought not to be satisfied with less. She is perfectly in the right if she criticises her work and tries to improve it. Instinctively, woman criticises man. Already as a little girl she assumes the rôle of criticising her little brothers and will tell her ma about their shortcomings. When a woman marries, it is with a secret, and not always secret, intention of reforming him, or make a man out of him, which implies that she does not consider him as such already. This tendency to criticise man caused preaching to become a part of

worship. And the fame of many famous preachers and revivalists rests on their ability to call man vile names, sinner, drunkard, idler, etc., and on the delight of the saved, especially woman, to hear man thus derided. While some preaching is good, it is a great question if a preaching that often degenerates into an everlasting nagging does any good. Criticism of man might be safely left to woman alone, and preaching as a profession without loss to the community be abolished.

Only on rare occasions will a woman say to a man, "You are all right." And nothing, by the way, pleases a man more than to hear a woman tell him that. He knows the severity of his judge.

This tendency to criticise man, however, is not confined to woman only. It is the attitude of slaves towards their masters. In fact, many of the characteristics that are considered womanly, are identical with the characteristics of slaves and by emancipation, may be obliterated.

The feminine was strong in Nietzsche, and gave him an almost girlish admiration for the soldier. If the will to rule was lacking, the best was lacking, and his Zarathustra deplored that he lacked the voice of command. So the voice of command and the will to rule is dear to the girlish heart. The absolute surrender to her lover comes natural and easy for her then. But later on the voice of command begins to grate on her nerves, and the will to rule on the part of her husband, makes her rebellious.

Woman's attitude towards man is also her attitude towards the deity, and different from that of a man towards God, which is the same as his attitude towards woman.

Only woman can fear and love at the same time. It is indeed a question if she can love a man unless there be something in him which she fears. In the same way she fears and loves God and seeks to win his favor by worship, flattery, hymns of praise, and by pretending to be humble and by absolute surrender to his will. In short, she enjoys to be overcome by a superior force and be made irresponsible for what follows. This is the feminine attitude toward man and God and all right as far as it goes.

Man, on the other hand, approaches the woman he loves, timidly at first, perhaps, and with a feeling akin to fear, but with no intention or inclination to surrender. His intention and desire is to make her yield to him. So in regard to God. What a man fears, he also hates and will try to overcome or make harmless by magic, incantations, sacrifices, etc. By this attitude, man mastered physical conditions, and in time, shall master the spiritual conditions.

In the war between sexes, woman accuses man of having taken advantage of her weakness and enslaved her. But let us not forget that men, too, have been enslaved by other men. The division of mankind into masters and slaves is, therefore, not a purely sexual division. And the war between the sexes will cease with the realization of the freedom of the individual.

Woman, as man's natural opponent, made one of the church fathers exclaim, "Woman, thou art the gates of hell!" This exclamation, however, only proves that the church father had not mastered his passions. If his heart's desires had been at peace with one another like the animals in the Garden of Eden, or like cats and dogs in the same kitchen, the church father would have said in his heart, "Woman, thou art the gates of Paradise!" Only by encountering and overcoming opposition, can we grow in wisdom and power and at last be qualified to enter that blessed garden. And what good shall it do the woman to be the gates of paradise, or how indeed can she be unless there be a lord to enter? When the King of glory is lost in man, the Garden of Eden is lost not only to him but to woman.

Men's ideal man is a *gentle* man, a man among men, a King. But to give a definition of what constitutes the character of a gentleman or King is just as hard to explain in what beauty consists. We become aware of beauty of the objective world, instinctively as we do of the beauty of character.

The gentleman is the direct descendant of the kings or chieftains of our ancestors, and if we can form an idea of what they expected of their kings, we shall also have gained some insight into what our descendants shall expect of theirs.

Ideal kings were spoken of as fortunate in having friends, ('Vennescele,' *fredscele*). They were not criminals nor of the criminal type. Their main functions were to defend the kingdom and make things interesting within the realm and for the neighbors. In war the king was the leader, in peace, the head of a social center larger than that of the family. One who was just, who was no respector of persons, a stiller of storms, a prince of peace. Such we imagine his character to be, whom the majority would give the title, King, in a composite Utopia, and this would be in conformity with the ideal king of old.

The fierce, the terrible, the criminal type was represented by the "Berserk," a character similar to Jesse James and other famous outlaws. But while this class of men, then as now, compelled a certain kind of admiration, they were not considered ideal men.

The king is the embodiment of the well-bred man, and as such, the ideal social man, the most highly civilized man at any

time. But being the culmination or end at any given time, the king is necessarily a conservative man, and this, the male ideal of a man is an ideal with great limitations, and as an only ideal, not sufficient for the race.

Woman's ideal man, though he be a law-breaker, is needed when kings and gentlemen are not leaders, but jailers in the prisons of outgrown laws and customs. And when kings degenerate into idols to hold people in awe and to protect vested rights, they are self-condemned.

True kings never oppressed people with their virtues in a Christian sense of that word. Neither is a gentleman a saint. But in spite of this, there are a great many things a man cannot do or be and still be considered a gentleman. A true gentleman, though he may have loved too well, but not wisely, or drank more than he ought to, can be depended upon to act as a gentleman even under these trying circumstances. So a king, though not a saint, cannot do certain things or be of a certain kind of a man and still be considered a king. This is the meaning of the doctrine that the king can do no wrong.

In the presence of the king, we are free as we are free among cultured people who willingly would do us no harm nor shame us in any way. Woman's ideal man, the limitless super-man, Jehovah, we willingly concede to be the greatest. Nevertheless, men's ideal man, the king, is an ideal worth preserving, and woman would lose just as much as man if that ideal was lost. And as there is a period of our life previous to the mating season and the home growing out of that season, and also a period following that season, prudence dictates that we provide social institutions like the proposed courts where the sexual affairs are subordinated to the intellectual.

In my search for truth, I came across the following gem—found on page two hundred and sixty-eight in Dr. Gustav Adolf Lindner's book, "Empirical Psychology."—"The fool is free from those considerations which give the judicious pause. He blurts out the truth, where the wise man dares only think. Hence, in earlier times the custom of keeping for this purpose artificial fools, called 'court fools.'"

And it occurred to me that henceforth my quest must be for an artificial fool, and where should I find him unless it be in some utopian court of the future? What court or what institution today could afford to keep an artificial fool?

GODS AND HEAVENS

In us and through us the creative forces rising to our brains broke the bonds of physical existence and the spiritual world came to be. Although the creations of our fancy, like the stuff that dreams are made of, are intangible, and in other respects, different from concrete things, they must, nevertheless, be governed by laws analogous to the laws of physics. As a field can be cultivated, and certain growths given a preference, so also the minds of men can be and has been cultivated to sustain certain ideas. Civilization is this cultivation. But as the soil sometimes gives out and cannot be made to yield a certain kind of grain any more, so the minds of men sometimes refuse to entertain ideas that once flourished, or become incapable of entertaining them and the civilization depending on these ideas or ideals dies a natural death.

Why mourn? The field is there, though impoverished. Give it a rest and rest shall restore its fruitfulness. Some day it shall bloom again like a wild meadow with a myriad of different flowers. From the utopian point of view, the wild meadow is superior to the wheat field. It is our ideal, and he who puts tares among the wheat is not an enemy but a savior, a savior from the dreary ideal of sameness.

The spiritual world generated in our brains and filled with the children of our fancy, exerts a greater influence over us than the physical world and the physical forms swarming upon the face of the earth. They are parts of ourselves, and it is almost impossible to rise above what is created or planted in our minds and given an existence.

"What manifold robbery have I not put up with in the history of the world! There I let sun, moon and stars, cats and crocodiles, receive the honor of ranking as I; there Jehovah, Allah and Our Father came and was invested with the I; there families, tribes, peoples, and at last, actually mankind, came and were honored as I's. There the Church, the State, came with the pretensions to be I—and I gazed calmly on all. What wonder if then there was always a real I, too, that joined the company and affirmed in my face that it was not my *you* but my real I. Why, *the Son of Man*, par-excellence had done the like; why should not *a Son of Man* do it too? So I saw my I always above me and outside me, and could never really come to myself."*

* Max Stimer, "The Ego and His Own," page 295.

FAIRYLAND

The first Heaven of which we have any record is generally known under the name of Fairyland. Here we meet with an endless number of beings which scientists never shall recognize as real. Yet, once upon a time they were believed to be so, and were therefore capable of influencing the real world. And they were true to life; friendly, hostile or indifferent to one another like real beings. Since this, the first Heaven, shall most closely resemble our last, that is, the utopian heavens, it is worth the while to dwell on its character for a moment, for what is utopianism after all, but an attempt to make out of this earth of ours a Fairyland where wonders shall never cease, and as this close resemblance to Fairyland is not likely to be disputed by anyone, we need not dwell on this point any further.

Fairyland is democratic. Every boy has there a chance. He can marry a princess, and the poorest girl can marry a prince. And in Fairyland, by marriage, the princes get half the kingdom. Always only half the kingdom. Could anything be fairer? We feel sure that with an equal division of the kingdom, all quarrels between the sexes would vanish and all go on beautifully as when fairy tales were true.

The idea of slavery in the sense in which we commonly use that word is absent in most fairy tales. But numerous instances are related of princes and princesses held in bondage by some evil ogre, who has cast a charm over them, and how the spell can only be broken and the imprisoned souls set at liberty by some heroic deed or great sacrifice.

The moral teachings of the fairy tales are simple enough. This is the moral of most of them: Boys, starting out on their adventures, meet some old man or woman, ugly, helpless, or in sore distress. The boys that ignore or ill treat these unfortunate ones meet with disaster, while those that give them a glad hand become successful. For these unfortunate beings are fairies in disguise, with power to avenge themselves on the unfriendly and the ability to help those who helped them.

Once upon a time men believed in fairy tales, but this time is past. Told as true they are not tolerated; but throwing that pretense away and being simply what they are, namely, fairy tales, and providing they are true to life, and wonderful as life is wonderful, they survive and gain immortality.

POLYTHEISM

Out of Fairyland rose the gods of Olympus, Valhalla and other high places. They were all the gods of an aristocracy, an upper class or oligarchy. As some families rose to prominence here on earth, so their fairy gods ascended in the heavens. And when these upper classes went down, down went their gods with them. So closely is heaven and earth connected.

The morals under Polytheism are not much different from those in Fairyland, but the gods are more distant than the fairies, only occasionally visiting the earth. This is especially the case with the gods on Olympus, Valhalla is nearer the earth and the earthly origin of gods in Valhalla is more easily discernible.

Asgard, the home of the gods of the Norse mythology, was, as the name implies, only an idealized farm. (Asur, the family name of these gods, Gard, a farm or homestead).

The myths of Northern Europe were most likely created before the races of these regions had any cities, so instead of a Holy City, the Jerusalem that is above, they imagined a Holy Farm—Asgard—on high. Valhalla was only a feature of that farm, a hall of festivities answering the purpose of a guild hall of a later period, or of a saloon or a club of the present day. The gods were not primarily conceived of as rulers. Their relation to men, their descendants, was that of powerful friends and protectors, especially of the better class, that is, of the aristocracy. None of the gods were perfect. One was wise, one was strong, one was swift and so on. Nor were they moral in the sense of being obedient, like law-abiding citizens or in any other sense. On the contrary, they were quarrelsome, wilful and capricious, as powerful individuals among men generally are. In Norse mythology, only one god, Balder, was good. So the myth-makers made him die young, and related how a blind god killed Balder unintentionally during a game. Balder went to hell as good gods generally do. The good never do well. Gods, as a rule, have been spoken of as immortal, but the gods in Valhalla were not supposed to be, and among the myths of these gods was the prophecy of "Ragnarök," or the destruction of the god or the twilight of the gods, as it is sometimes translated. This is a novel feature and worth noting since the prophecy came true. Where is now Odin, Thor, or Frey? Gone and forgotten. Only the names of some of our week days remain to remind us that they once were. But wisdom did not die with the one-eyed Odin—his eye was single. War did not come to an end with Thor, nor industry with Frey. And Balder, the good god, like the poor, we shall always have with us.

As it happened to the mortal gods of Norsemen, so it happened to the immortal gods of Greeks and Egyptians. They are gone.

Once upon a time, Egyptian priests, no doubt, pointed to the magnificent temples as a visible proof of the existence of their gods as priests today point to the church buildings as a proof of the truth of their religion. Gods die hard, but they die. The Romans clung to their gods long after all faith in them was gone and it came to pass that their priests could not look at each other without laughing. At last Romans played "duck on the rock" with the heads of idols whom their forefathers had revered. Many beautiful statutes were thus destroyed and we cannot help but regret that the Romans did not in time relegate their mythologies, like other fairy tales, to the nurseries.

MONOTHEISM

In Polytheism, one god was generally recognized as the head of the family of gods, and this naturally lead to the idea that there is only one god. "Hear Israel, the Lord God our God is one." It is a centralization of power that is and must be the envy of all imperialists. Despotism of any kind has in Monotheism its strongest support. But outside the family, nothing like perfect despotism has ever been realized. Emperors, monarchs or high priests or popes, or under what other name this idea has been embodied, has always been obliged to share their power with a nobility or priesthood, and to that extent, Monotheism partakes of the characteristics of the conditions under Polytheism. Only with this difference that the one god became more distant than the many gods, so distant that mediators or middle men were needed as go-betweens—between the common people and God. Under Polytheism, gods were the friends and kindred of the people. The one God at last became the opponent of men. An idea already existing during the reign of the many gods as instanced by the Prometheus myth.

It is natural and also reasonable to believe in God, more especially in one God. And a simple faith in God as the father of us all, who answers our prayers, ever ready to help us in our afflictions if we do right, and to sustain us in any worthy cause is a source of strength to us individually and collectively. It is only when men begin to form definite ideas of the Infinite Father that the trouble begins.

The Jews in their time and ahead of their time, refused to bow down to gods made by hand, gods carved out of wood and stone. But instead, they made a god in their imagination, a

spiritual god, *an invisible idol*. This innovation proved to be superior to other gods and in his name and by his power the *many* idols of other nations were overthrown. And the Jews and the Christians and the Mohammedans after them became the greatest of all idolators.

The god made by the Jews was a tribal god but the merging of all the national gods into one god did not change his character. He was, is still, and ever must be, a tribal god. Only a personal God, that is *my* individual God can lift me above the tribal god. The idea of a tribal god being *one* necessarily brings about war between nations and between factions within the nations.

The spirit of the Christian idolators is fierce. Witness the fanatical glare in the eyes of a revivalist, for instance, when he shouts to the crowd, "Get down on your knees! Get down on your knees!" For this is the sole desire of all idolators, to bring everybody down on their knees before their idols, and their hatred of those who look calmly on is boundless.

The god of the Jews, Our God, is conceived to be a perfect and a Holy God, and the demand is made that we shall be perfect as he is perfect. This demand makes sinners of us all.

Already the Greeks knew that if the camel had a god, that god would be humpbacked, and we venture to guess that if a camel should create a god in the image of a horse, and try to be perfect as a horse is perfect, the original sin, that he is humpbacked, would cling to him still and that no wonderful way of salvation could ever free him from it. A thistle bloom and a bumble bee are both perfect, but if the bloom should try to fly and the bee would want to sit on a stalk and bloom, both would be failures.

Today we witness the same spectacle as that unfolded in the declining days of the Roman gods. Instead of preparing for the reception of the Son and Heir to Jehovah, many of our leading men cling to phases of thought which laboring men would be ashamed to acknowledge and which school boys no longer entertain, and all in vain. To be sure, there is a class affinity between Jehovah and the capitalists. And when they operate with watered stock, they are like the austere nobleman in the gospel parable of whom it was said, "Thou takest up that which thou layest not down, and reapest that which thou didst not sow." But in pinning their faith on Christianity, are they not supporting themselves on a crumbling wall? We cannot help but regret that the class mentioned does not seem to be alive to their opportunities or to have grasped the situation. They are radical enough in their private affairs, and if they applied the same radicalism toward a needed social re-adjust-

ment, it would follow swift and sure. We are so used to thinking of any reform movement as originated from below that we forget that great changes often have been inaugurated from above. To mention only a recent example, the transformation of Japan into a modern state.

Upper classes derive their main strength from an estimation in the minds of the multitude, that in spite of all their faults, intellectually, they are superior. For such is the pride of intellect, that if we, for example, meet a man today who believes as our forefathers did that the earth is flat, and sometimes we meet such, we cannot help but feel that he in some respects is inferior, no matter how excellent a character he otherwise may be. And when we read in the newspapers that great financiers attend Bible conferences, or that the "Men and Religion Forward Movement," is supported from Wall Street we cannot help but feel that the capitalist class is either stupid, or that they act from motives that are not honorable. In both cases, it affects us as a confession of weakness on their part.

When the real master in any trade or profession is the leader all those who follow that trade or profession feel it an honor to follow his leadership and act according to his direction. If an inferior is put at the head of any concern, strife and contention follows. So also in national affairs. And the social unrest we read about, and of which we are all of us more or less aware, is caused not so much by an unequal distribution of wealth as by a conviction gaining ground that the leading men of the nation are not upright men, especially in regard to religious matters.

The best men shall be the leaders. This is the more or less conscious demand. To serve a higher cause or follow the leadership of higher men is ennobling. To surrender to the lower as represented by adherents to outgrown idols, material or spiritual, is a disgrace.

The disgrace of such an act is more clearly seen at a public demonstration of hypnotism. No one who has witnessed a performance of that kind will deny that it is a disgraceful act, both on the part of the hypnotist and that on the part of those who surrender their will to his will, and in this hypnotic state are made fools of or by their surrender make fools of themselves.

And have we not the same feeling at a revival? Is it not with a sense of shame that we see human beings like ourselves come under the hypnotic influence of a revivalist and surrender their will or give their heart to God, as it is called. Verily, the "sawdust trail" is more damaging to character than the saloon and the

brothel. It goes deeper. And this shameless traffic in human souls meets the approval of leading men in the community, and that of the pulpit and the press, largely controlled by the same men.

This traffic is similar to the sale of indulgences by the Monk Tetzel in the time of Luther. There it was purgatory and now it is the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost that is used to scare the wits and the money out of the poor in spirit. Tetzel, by his sale of indulgences and in his zeal to raise money, probably went beyond what was authorized by the Catholic Church, but it can at least be said in his favor that it was for an ideal purpose, the building of a beautiful cathedral. The revivalist traffic in salvation has no such purpose and is equally disgusting and the Protestant church by supporting such traffic have laid themselves open to the same charges of corruption as the Catholic church did by tolerating the traffic of Tetzel.

The hypnotic power or the power of suggestion which is a religious force, however, is not and has not always been misused. It has been and is used as a means of healing and refining. So also the worshiping of an image of a higher being, be that being a god or a man, and be that image material or spiritual, has been a means towards civilizing people and no doubt shall be so in the future.

But when we outgrow certain gods and forms of worship, we must create new forms of worship, in conformity with our new ideas of God and Heaven, and leave the old forms to those who still need them.

The twilight of our God is nigh. But still the will to believe in the old idol hangs heavily on our hearts like the seeds from which they sprang hangs heavily on the tops of the beans just sprouting. Perhaps all that can be expected of us is that we shall serve as stalks on which some giant killer in the future shall climb up to heaven and kill that Ogre.

PUBLIC OPINION

No one denies the existence or the power of that god. When awakened, public opinion carries everything before it, completely overpowering the will and judgment of mere individuals. This is strikingly illustrated in times of panic, when intelligent men lose their heads, and also in times of war, when believers in universal brotherhood are turned into soldiers in the twinkling of an eye.

The soul of a crowd which constitutes public opinion may be lacking in intelligence, but it has a heart. If a wireless message

from the crew of a sinking ship, reaches that of another ship or a people at shore, an effort will be made to save it. So in other perilous positions. If people can reach them, they are saved. But it has no real will of its own, only a deep desire that something should be done. Therefore the crowd loves the man who wills, no matter what. Hence the power of all Napoleons. Although this soul of the crowd has been imposed upon and misused again and again, its demoniacal or fanatical strength should not be despised as a last resort. For neither love nor fury is blind. When the gentle light of intelligence fades from the eyes it is superseded by the fierce glow of instinct, and an end is attained.

At the same time, for my own safety and for the safety of civilization, it seems desirable that the power of the individual be increased and that of the crowd diminished.

And the founders of our republic recognized this, that the individual shall have the freedom to create or change the public opinion to the extent of his will and ability, and that his connection with the soul of the community shall not be severed. So we are granted the right of free speech and a free press, and we in our eternal vigilance must avail ourselves of our freedom, and see to it that the lines of communication are kept open and that the advertising mediums are not monopolized.

All idols, material and spiritual, derive their power from public opinion about them and our attitude towards idols or gods of that kind shall be the same as our attitude towards public opinion. How far I ought to surrender to it and how far I ought to oppose it must be an individual question which no one but myself can answer. For some, perhaps the majority, the question does not present itself since they have no opinion at variance with the public opinion, but for some at least, it shall be a question of gaining the world and losing their souls or losing their souls and gaining the world.

REFLECTIONS

What enables me, I, who am the real I, to look calmly on, is intelligence. By this reflector we can view existence under a peculiar angle that detaches us from the instinctive life and leaves us free to act upon it, and if we so choose, go contrary to its ways. The simple act of winking an eye when there is no outward cause for doing so, reveals its nature, and by its use our character is revealed. It is particularly human. If we saw an animal wilfully close one eye when looking at us, we would be horror stricken, realizing that the brute had human sense.

Intelligence is a fatal gift as it lifts us above the physical world and its continuation the spiritual world. It enables a man even to rise above himself so he can look down upon himself and study himself and the laws of his being.

Intelligence may be regarded as a sixth sense by which I behold the impressions of the other senses as a whole. Like a lens that unites the prismatic colors into one white light, intelligence finds unity in diversity as the saying is. It is destructive. As the colors of the rainbow by a lens uniting them are destroyed, so the forms of life, unified by intelligence, are in a certain sense done away with. Look what happened to fairies, goblins, gnomes, etc. Our intelligence killed them. We see the trend, first fairies, then the many gods, then the one god, then monism and at last, Nirvana. But if we imagine that the blighting effect of intelligence stops with the destruction of the creation of our fancy, we are very much mistaken. Thoughts, like clouds, obscure our vision but when our mental sky shall be clear, when we are enlightened, then we shall know without thinking that the physical world as well is nothing but "Maja" or illusion. So we are told. But I also know without thinking that I am, even if I don't think. I may be unconscious, but still I am. So the physical world is, even if no one knows it with that particular knowledge, which is gained by intelligence. And as that knowledge cannot destroy the physical world, neither can it destroy the children of my fancy as such. And if they are given form, as creations of art and industry or institutions, or mechanical devices, etc., they attain life and reality and exert a greater influence than physical beings. And are not the creation of spiritual beings and the faith in certain spiritual beings, just as inevitable under certain conditions as the appearance of certain species of plants and animals must be inevitable under given conditions. And so is their disappearance inevitable under certain other conditions.

"He that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow." So it is said and to some extent that is true. Because the knowledge dependent on intelligence makes me aware of the rights and the sorrows of others and puts me under the obligation of setting right that which by my knowledge has become part of myself. From this, however, it must not be implied that knowledge necessarily makes gloomy or pessimistic. The sadness comes only from a lack of knowledge of what to do in a new, a painful or perplexing situation. When we have found what we think is reasonable to do under the circumstances, and have decided to follow that course, we go on our way rejoicing.

From these considerations, it follows that intelligence, like the lesser senses, is only a light on our way. What we shall do by the help of light, is another question. It tends to make us neutral, but in the world of phenomena, is it not wicked to be neutral?

He that sitteth in heaven shall laugh. Maybe. But if he shuts the door for anyone, it is a wicked laughter. And laughter can be extremely wicked, and, as caused by intelligence, destructive. For in spite of the fact that laughter is more prevalent among the simple minded, and that we have laughing idiots, it is nevertheless a sign of intelligence. Animals don't laugh. Laughing hyenas is only a figure of speech.

Professionals, business men and great financiers and politicians do not laugh much at least not in public, but that's probably only their policy. Heroes, we presume, laugh only at great occasions. We have heard about homeric laughter. Innocent laughter is god-like and even more destructive than wicked laughter. When we can laugh innocently at the gloomy ghosts of the past and at the pretensions of pretenders of the present time we are saved. This laughter should not be ascribed to a lack of seriousness or lack of reverence on the part of men. Towards that which is genuine and true or can be held as genuine and true at a given stage of enlightenment, man has always felt reverence, and always will.

Far be it from me to underestimate the value of truth, but let not our love of truth blind us to the fact that lies have a legitimate place in the general makeup of things. There is a difference between an axiom and a dogma as there is a difference between the God of Truth and the Father of Lies, but the God that is all in all and All must necessarily be the author of both. Recognizing lies as legitimate, we shall have done away with the necessity of parading the creations of our imagination, in the garb of truth and we shall have made it easier to draw a distinct line between what is self evident and what can be proved or demonstrated on the one hand and what on the other hand is not true in that sense or beyond our comprehension, but as a theory or poem is satisfactory to our reason, our sense of justice, our sense of beauty.

It is hardly correct to say that we love truth. We want to know, which is a different thing. A problem solved does not interest us any more, it cannot hold our attention. We live by doubt, and where there is a hole in our knowledge, there inventors, investigators and higher critics are sure to congregate. We love truth only as our property, and if it was threatened by thieves, we should defend it. But how can anyone take away from me what I know? What I know is a treasure laid up in heaven. A treasure that moth and rust cannot corrupt nor thieves break in and steal.

The craving to know is insatiable. Province after province is added to the empire of knowledge, but there are holes left open to be filled with faith. Every mother will testify that it is easier to satisfy a child's hunger for food and drink, than to satisfy its craving to know. Everlastingly, children ask "Why?" With large eyes, and heads so big, so way out of proportion to the size of their bodies, what are they but live interrogation marks? And soon the mother's supply of knowledge is not sufficient and the children must be fed with substitutes. "Who made me? Where did I come from?" These are common questions, and the common answers, "God made you" and "The stork brought you" satisfy most children. The naked truth in many matters for most children, would be more perplexing and less satisfying. But there are exceptional children who would perceive that these answers were only evasions. For them the naked truth would be better.

It is a serious matter, and may prove a permanent injury to some children, to have their faith in their parents and elders broken. And there is something beautiful in this: The children looking to their elders for information with a perfect trust that they shall receive the truth; and something pathetic in this, that our limited knowledge and other considerations, makes lying necessary. Sooner or later the discovery comes that they have been imposed upon. In minor matters, as those referred to above, an intelligent child will see that they were harmless and necessary. But when it comes to more elaborate fabrications of the imagination like the prevailing religious systems, it is a more serious matter. For it comes inevitable to many a young man, this discovery, that in order to succeed in certain careers, it is necessary to play the hypocrite, or cater to public opinion, and if he is so constituted that he is subject to truth, this discovery shall have a blightening effect on him. Though he knows not exactly how it happened, yet he shall feel that the world in which he dreamed of making a success, is not the same world any more. Its glory has passed away. Few, perhaps, are so constituted, but for those who cannot compromise with their conscience, it becomes imperative that they create a simple or complex faith, so it be after their own heart and social forms where that faith and their loyalty to truth as they see it shall be a help instead of a hindering in their social ambition.

Once upon a time the blank spaces in our knowledge were many and wide. These were the glorious times for myth-makers. Now there is hardly an opening left. For we are bound to complete with lies what we lack in knowledge. Gods and the wonderful stories of creation and the days of doom filled the gaps. There,

too, the fishers of men spread out their nets. To have faith in their stories was the way to salvation. Faith was essential. Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, and faith as a substitute for knowledge is all right, so long as we consider it like a scientist considers a hypothesis or working theory which he is ready to discard the moment it does not work any more, a theory he is free to invent and which it is sometimes necessary to invent until he has the naked truth. But if we accept faith as the substance of the things hoped for and let it go at that, we shall never have the real thing. Faith in utopias, for an example, shall not bring them about. A doubt so great that nothing but seeing them realized shall ever convince us that such things can be, is required, and we have all reason to believe that such a doubt exists in many minds.

Faith as a substitute for knowledge can never be fully satisfying, and there is always a saving element of doubt mixed with it. "Is my faith firm enough and have I the right faith?" And this is the advantage of faith over knowledge, that it leaves room for doubt, and that it gives to existence a speculative value, and to all a gambling chance.

A new truth or new discovery is not and cannot be opposed to or out of harmony with what we already know. But filling the holes in our knowledge with new knowledge must necessarily alter the shape of that which has been accepted as a substance for truth. Therefore all who live by faith or put their hopes on what has been accepted by faith as equivalent to truth invariably oppose the seekers for knowledge. Sneeringly the faithful defenders of faith spoke of the so-called science, now the mortal mind is derided.

Great indeed is the power of faith. One who is hypnotized into the belief that a chair is a dog, when told to examine the object and does so, while still in the hypnotic state, finds by examining the chair, convincing proof that it is a dog. Here, to begin with, he finds the four legs, and then the back of the chair is sticking up like a tail, so he is ready to swear, "By God, it is a dog."

A better way to escape the tyranny of faith than by investigating it, is to examine another faith. For a Christian, the Mohammedan faith, for instance. In Mohammed he meets a character that probably will appeal to him more than Jesus and the Arabian conception of the one and only God may be more to his liking than the Jewish idea of the same personality. But here we shall run another risk. It has happened to the translators of the Koran that they have been converted to Mohammedanism. The Bible has the same power to hypnotize. Let an atheist read the Psalms of David several days in succession, and the chances are he shall come under

the influence of the faith by which they were inspired. So he at last shall almost feel the holy presence of Jehovah. But so also by reading the work of those who sought or are seeking truth rather than salvation, I shall be delivered from faith, even the faith that faith is necessary for my happiness.

Now let us suppose that the temple of truth is complete, the empire of knowledge all-embracing. In other words, that we know everything, that there is no room for doubt. The condition, we imagine, would then be similar to the condition prevailing when man imagined that he had a perfect faith, a faith that left no room for doubt. There was no escape from it and mankind was imprisoned in it for hundreds of years. So in our temple of truth we should be imprisoned. And what escape is there from the conclusions of science, when our knowledge shall be complete?

It is told of the ancient builders of temples that they never made their structures fully complete, they always left out one stone. May not the idea of this have been that they realized that completeness is not perfection, that perfection requires that there be one weak spot where it as a seed may sprout and give birth to a new and grander sanctuary, involving its own destruction.

I am that weak spot in the temple of truth. I am by science reduced to nothing. But as the mysterious nothing I am that out of which everything that is, proceeds. I can do what is unreasonable and am therefore not subject to the laws of nature. I am the hole in our understanding that scientists cannot fill. I am the door, I am the way. And if it becomes necessary, I shall throw my soul as an invisible stone into the heavens and accidentally hit something that shall change the course of human events.

To quote the words of Immanuel Kant, "I am responsible only to myself; I must follow none other; I must not forget myself even in my work; I am alone, I am free, I am lord of myself."

If I surrender myself absolutely to any other power visible or invisible, I have committed my last crime and will probably get peace, but I am not a moral being any more. "Thou to thine own self be true."

THE PEARL OF GREAT PRICE

As an individual, I come in contact with many things, and in touch with my fellow beings, and all the subtle forces of the universe. To the extent which I become aware of them, to that extent I may learn to understand their ways and either avoid them or use them to my or their advantage or to my or their destruction. And as I am able to enter into sympathetic understanding of be-

ings different from me, and though they dwell in the uttermost regions, who can separate me from anything and who can put a limit to my power?

Complete consciousness is the pearl of great price. Like a pearl, it is rarely perfect, and like a pearl, it is liable to decay. Constant friction, it seems, is required to maintain its brilliancy. Common self-consciousness is the common attribute of all men, but even that phase of consciousness varies greatly in different individuals. It may be narrow, scarcely going beyond the boundaries set by instinct, or it may be extended so as to include all there is. I may be conscious of the present time only, and like an animal, have no consciousness of the past and no dreams of the future. Or, I may in memory be conscious of the past and in anticipation, be conscious of the times to come. Again, I may be conscious of the outer world, or what we speak of as the real world, to the exclusion of the inner world, or spiritual realities. In rare cases, the reverse of this.

As a rule, attention and the consequent vivid consciousness of one phase of existence, tends to exclude the consciousness of other phases.

Of these more or less limited states of consciousness, what we shall call the Olympian consciousness is the most common. Generally speaking, it is the most pleasurable consciousness, hence its popularity. It is the consciousness of victory and success.

From the safe place, Olympus, the immortal gods looked down on the struggling men without pity. To them the struggle was an amusing spectacle. And, by the way, we today, if we are not personally involved, read the war news in a purely Olympian spirit, although we hate to admit it and cover up our lack of consciousness of the suffering caused by war with a lot of fine phrases.

The consciousness of those who have "made their pile" in most cases is purely Olympian. The suffering of the poor does not affect them.

But this merely Olympian consciousness of life as a spectacle that does not vitally concern us is apt to grow tedious. So we read that the gods occasionally came down to earth and assumed different shapes in order to experience the sensations of earthly beings. Somewhat for the same reason and in the same manner society folks go "slumming" or assume the rôle of laboring people or tramps. But a god taking on the shape of a man still retains his Olympian consciousness. Likewise a millionaire temporarily playing the part of a hobo retains the consciousness of the rich man.

To realize the consciousness of earthly beings, they would have to forget that they were gods and the rich to experience the life of the poor would have to forget that they were rich. There is no royal or easy way to consciousness, be it the consciousness of heaven or the consciousness of hell.

To attain and maintain the Olympian consciousness is essential to success in most of our undertakings. If I allow the consciousness of the defeated to enter my mind, my enterprise is doomed beforehand. But to maintain this godlike consciousness in the midst of misery is no easy task. For some it is impossible unless they practice some self deception. For example, by making myself the champion of the poor and oppressed. By this twist and sustained by a firm faith in the justice and in the final victory of my cause, I shall gain Olympus. Authors and orators who like to dwell on the subject of human misery, we suspect at last comes to take an Olympian delight in the sufferings of human beings, and when they speak of brotherly love we feel that they themselves are not troubled with it any more. They have saved themselves if not others, and that is probably all any one should be expected to do. If everyone did that, we would all be saved. Probably no others can save us anyway and then it is the only way.

Olympian consciousness is but another name for class consciousness. As rich, I can maintain the blessed Olympian attitude and prevent the consciousness of the defeated from entering my mind by making them out to be thriftless drunkards, and generally speaking, a bad lot that richly deserves what is coming to them. In this we shall be greatly assisted by the Christian idea that a few only are saved and that the majority are doomed to everlasting hell. A purely Olympian idea. But besides this idea which favors the present order of things, Christianity has the other idea that after death things shall be reversed. The poor shall then be in heaven and the rich in hell. It is this that gives to Christianity its universal appeal.

Socialistic class consciousness is Christian-like in this that it gives solace to the suffering of the proletariat at present by an anticipation of victory in a time to come. No doubt the shrewdest members of the capitalist class secretly appreciate this religious or Christian-like attitude of socialism although they openly oppose it. Without faith in socialism proletarians and others might take matters in their own hands and individually save themselves collectively, that is, in co-operation with men and women of a similar disposition.

Leaving the Olympian consciousness, next we shall consider

the god consciousness, or cosmic consciousness as it is sometimes called, but we prefer the more familiar term. It is past our understanding. It is above or below the consciousness awakened by friction. At the same time there must be some kind of a relationship between our common self consciousness and the god consciousness attained by the few, a relationship that shall enable us to make a guess at its nature. To begin with, as our self consciousness is the outcome of the friction connected with physical existence, so god consciousness must, in some way, depend on the struggle here below. In thought or in imagination I am able to rise above the pains or pleasures caused by conflicts on the surface of our limited sphere. But although I am able to rise above my sensations, my ability to be aware of these sensations has its roots in the struggle for existence. So also god consciousness, though it lifts us above all earthly joys and sorrows, must in some way depend on the same struggle. They who remember their awakening to self consciousness will probably agree with me that it was a painless and exceedingly joyous event, a liberation. Nevertheless, it was acquired by friction and by the suffering, and the struggle of my ancestors, my race. It was bestowed on me as a free gift and heritage. And to increase this heritage or to maintain its brilliancy, new struggles and more sufferings are needed.

That pain increases the vividness of our consciousness has long been recognized. Asiatic adepts torture themselves for that purpose, and saints in western lands used to do the same. But to us of today, it seems more practical in order to make ourselves suffer, and by suffering, polish our pearl of great price, that we should try to do something hard or almost impossible, something that shall require all our strength or preferably be beyond our power to accomplish. And the humiliation following the failure of our effort, when we have become the laughing stock for all our friends, shall give us more pain than the self inflicted wounds gave to the flagellants. And as our self consciousness was gained by our struggle against outward forces, may not god consciousness be gained in the same way?

The main thing is to rise above the pain. To the extent that we are able to do so, we are liberated from the limitations of physical existence. Take the common, yet very painful experience of a man who receives "no" for an answer when he wants to marry a girl and proposes to her. The excruciating pain caused by this cruel "no" is often enough to drive a man crazy. And many men in madness will kill themselves or others. But one with a more philosophical mind or with a consciousness liberated by previous painful experiences of this or similar kinds in his en-

counter with the opposite sex or other opposing forces, will often, during such a trying ordeal, and somewhat to his surprise, discover that he possesses an inner calmness that is never touched by the collapse of his dream of happiness. A discovery that amply repays him for the torture endured. And may it not be so with all the bitter experiences of life, culminating in death itself?

Now ascetic ideals rest on views like these, and we cannot deny that ascetic practices strengthen our will, clears our consciousness and are beneficial to our bodies as well, if not too severe. But this holds good only when it is felt as a natural need, in short, when it is practiced at the proper time and the proper age, by proper individuals. In the Christian baptism, children, by proxy, are made to renounce the devil, the flesh and the world, but this renunciation is somewhat premature. Everything in its time. A higher consciousness, artificially gained, too, it seems, must be somewhat premature, as the premature ripening of a berry that has been stung by a poisonous insect, or in other ways maimed. While the flavor is genuine, the berry as a whole cannot compare with those which have ripened naturally in the sun. So also, we infer, the souls of those who have ripened naturally, and at last pass away satisfied with days are the more fortunate and perhaps shall reach a higher state of consciousness, than those who prematurely killed their desires for the things of this world instead of satisfying them.

The only advantage of this higher consciousness prematurely acquired, is to others. Since it is attained while they are still in the flesh, they can, to us, their fellowmen in the flesh, give some idea of this stage of consciousness. They who die a natural death are prevented from doing this, since their awakening comes after life has left the body.

Exceedingly sweet are the sayings of the god conscious men. And the reality of that state of mind is proved by the sameness of their sentiments, though widely separated in time and space like Laotze, Buddha and Christ, all supposed to be god conscious. These men were what we should call degenerates, differing from ordinary degenerates in this—and this is a great difference—that they attained ripeness of soul ere decay of the body set in. Therefore, their words, like ripe seeds falling to the ground, give life and reality to the inner, the spiritual world. Of the three mentioned the god consciousness of Laotze seems to have been the purest. So far as we knew, he *willed* nothing. That is the test. For one whose individual consciousness is lost or lifted up into a consciousness created by all life is beyond the pleasure and pain necessary to keep the individual alive and cannot will any more. To him, everything that is, is good. Hence the peace.

We have had, however, god conscious men who imagined that they still had a will. Only that now, being at one with the universal will, everything went the way they willed it. If they wanted it to rain in a certain locality, then it rained there, if they willed a drought a drought there was and so on. Perhaps this state of consciousness is more common than we at first imagine. Sometimes we become aware of it in the presence of older people, whose very presence conveys a sense of perfect peace and contentment. They have resigned themselves to the universal will.

Buddha willed and taught a way to Nirwana. This indicates that he himself had not yet fully arrived. He was on his way, and his followers, millions of them, overrun India as religious mendicants or tramps, beating their way to Nirwana with flower-adorned begging bowls.

There is a limit to our consciousness of pleasure. Passing beyond that limit, in a moment of ecstasy, it is lost. So also there is a limit to what we can suffer, and having reached that limit, we are made free. The suffering that shall linger for the longest time in our memory, perhaps beyond death and the grave, is a sore regret, that we did not do what we wanted to do the time we had the opportunity. How utterly small does not the consideration that prevented us from doing what we wanted to do, seem after a few years have passed, and how small shall not that which we now consider insurmountable appear to be in a time to come.

Generally speaking, god consciousness marks the beginning of the end. It cannot carry us beyond ourselves individually or collectively. That power is given to genius only. Therefore, in our own interest, and in the interest of the community, if we have genius and should feel god consciousness coming over us like a great gladness, then it is time to summon all our strength and nip it in the bud.

The god consciousness of Christ Jesus was spasmodic. Occasionally he had to withdraw from the multitude in order to regain it. At last he lost it entirely: "My God, My God! Why hast thou forsaken me?"

Jesus willed and willed intensely, to create the kingdom of heaven and earth. This shows that he was more of a genius than a god conscious man. And as a genius of that kind, he is of special interest to us, as utopians.

Although we don't intend to follow the God conscious men, we realize that it would be a great advantage to have them with us in the flesh. To have them with us always. Lovable and sympathetic, able and willing to forgive sins and not weary in well doing as they are they would speak to us words of comfort and joy;

words that would dry away our tears, and give us assurance of an eternal life beyond sorrow and pain. Their presence would also prevent the formation of priesthoods, who can know no more of God, soul or immortality than we know ourselves. They are only middlemen. If the god conscious were with us, knowing their sentiment, any improvement in earthly conditions we shall be able to create, we feel sure would meet with their approval.

Jesus as the embodiment of the suffering Christ, is of special interest to us. For the idea of a suffering Christ has the same significance for the social body as pain for the physical body. If we recognize it, we may find a remedy for it. If we ignore it, it may develop into a disease that shall kill us. But first, we must become conscious of it.

And this is the iron law that governs the suffering Christ: He cannot be better off than the poorest and most miserable member of society. Therefore, Jesus could truly say, "What ye have done unto the least of these my brethren, that ye have also done unto me."

But the sensation of pain shall not free us from it. If we, like the imitators of Christ in the mediæval times, inflict torture on ourselves in order to suffer like he suffered, we shall only have increased the sum of suffering, and pain shall then have lost its value as a warning that something is wrong.

To save Jesus, to save the suffering Christ, this should be and must be the aim of all utopians. For in creating an ideal commonwealth, we have also saved the soul of him who is conscious of the suffering of all. Nothing else can save him. And incidentally this shall save ourselves. It was said of Jesus, that he had saved others, but himself he could not save. Verily, one who is in pain is helpless and his judgment is distorted and his ways lead to hell. A suffering Christ is anti-Christ. But as pain may produce a Buddha delivered from all earthly afflictions, so Anti-Christ must and, in Christ Jesus, we shall assume, did come first. But in his second coming, we shall behold a new, a joyful Christ. Not with a crown of thorns on his head shall we see him in the day of resurrection, but "with leaves of grapevines in his hair."

AT SEA

Myriad minded is the layer of life that clings to our earth like a changing garment.

We are at sea. An ideal condition. At sea we are free. And today we shall cruise near the shore of the infinite, trying to discover a new, an unknown God, mainly to get rid of the old. He was created by the genius of another race, a race that was not

free, and is therefore to us a foreign god. But let not prejudice prevent us from reading the Bible. Many of its ideas about God shall be acceptable to us. The danger is that in accepting some, we be tainted by others that are not agreeable. The best way perhaps, would be to start with the foolish thought that there is no god. Perhaps our own god can be revealed to us only on condition that we discard that idea altogether. Who knows? We are entirely at sea in this matter. We, however, shall, for the time being, assume that there is a God and that he may be found. But let it be understood, we are not seeking a new faith but a new knowledge. "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." In seeking knowledge, we work towards the fulfillment of that prophecy by the prophet Habakkuk. How can we get knowledge, unless we seek it? Faith is a delusion and a snare. We had enough of the doings of the ages of faith, and more than enough of the doctrine that we are saved by faith alone, and the equally absurd notion that we need salvation. We are not lost, never was and never can be. We are at home, in the sea. By seeking we are saved, though we shall never reach our goal.

As for the old tribal god, we only wish that he would go away and take all of his servants with him. He was a murderer from the beginning and willed that his innocent son should die on the cross. That's enough. *Exit, Jehovah!*

The attitude of the whole organic world, especially the vegetable kingdom is a seeking upward. It may be symbolized into the figure of a little child, standing on tiptoe with outstretched arms and upturned face, striving to be kissed. It is the attitude of love and gives us no enlightenment. We shall therefore take the attitude of an intelligent boy who has outgrown the fairy tales, and to some extent overcome his affections, and for the first time looks up into the face of his father critically, not striving to be kissed, but striving to find out what kind of man his father is.

Saint and seers are pictured with upturned faces and a look of vacancy in their eyes somewhat like the stare in the eyes of infants. It is the instinctive attitude of faith and trust. Thinkers and philosophers, contemplating creation, are like Cain pictured with bowed head, looking downward. This is the natural attitude of intelligence. Now the attitude that we shall take is not like either of these exactly, but like that of a Cain looking upward. This attitude is rather irreverent. It is also unnatural. For our intelligence, like our senses, come to be in our struggle with concrete beings, and is therefore especially efficient in helping us to invent and use tools and implements. It was not primarily meant

to help us to discover the laws of nature and not at all for the purpose that we should turn around and look at our heavenly father critically. On this account, we cannot expect very much to begin with. Perhaps our first attempt shall be barren of results. But as our intelligence came to be and grew by paying attention to earthly affairs, so it may expand and increase so as to enable us to get an understanding of the heavenly affairs, provided we turn our attention in that direction, although we at first shall grope in the dark.

The first impression, so to speak, that we get of God, is that he is incomprehensible, and to gain some knowledge of the incomprehensible one, we try to compare him with something equally incomprehensible, namely, the ether. Some deny the existence of both of these, maintaining that these ideas are superfluous. The majority—which of course, cannot decide this matter—seems to be of the opinion that a medium like the ether is needed for the transmission of light waves and electrical currents, likewise for the operation of gravitation, and God, in our opinion, is needed for a successful operation of memory. Rather than speak of God as the supreme being, or the supreme intelligence, we should speak of him as the perfect memory as signifying his most useful or most indispensable attribute. If we understood the mechanism of memory, our knowledge of God would have been increased immensely, and if that were made clear to our understanding the mooted question as to the immortality of the soul would also be answered. There is a close connection between the question of the existence of God and the question of the immortality of the soul. Tentatively we shall assume that we live forever in the memory of God and come to his mind whenever conditions are favorable for our appearance in the physical world.

What we cannot understand about God is that he is spirit and still can have an attribute like memory, and what we cannot understand about the ether is that it is frictionless and still can be something that can act and can be acted upon. Perhaps it shall help us some to imagine that the ether is like a body and that God is the soul of that body, a soul pervading that body as that body, the ether, pervades everything. And this soul or God, although distinct from the ether, is acting upon it or through it, shaping the world according to his character.

God as a spirit filling all space and meeting no resistance in space cannot be conscious of space and utterly abandoned to his own will, in pursuit of the activities resulting from that will he cannot be conscious of time either.

Time moves at a uniform speed that can be measured by mechanical devices and carries everything that is with it including that which exists in memory. A motorcycle goes faster and farther in space than a caterpillar, but cannot pass it in time. In time they are equally present. To us it appears that time goes on and onward, but that may be only an illusion created by our upright position and our awakening to self consciousness in that position. If God was conscious of time to him it would appear that time moved inward to an infinite center, as it appears to us, when we lay us down to sleep. When we die we shall not feel that we go up to our Father. We go in to Him and we shall rest in Him.

Instinctive life which is nearest to the spirit of God or most nearly expresses his will, must to some extent, be conscious of space, but very imperfectly of time. A captive lion, walking back and forth in its cage, having no memory of the past and no dreams of the future and unable to realize the futility of its effort to get out, goes on and on until it is tired, but its vague longing to be free does not amount to a consciousness of time.

An utter abandonment to movement in space, never looking backward and never beyond what lies immediately ahead is the attitude of all beings lower than man. Among men, the speed maniac comes nearer to that God-like attitude and in his joy ride experiences some sort of communion with God, for by abandoning himself to the movement of his car, he overcomes space and kills time, in fact, loses consciousness of both, and is to that extent God-like, hence the joy. But a speed-maniac is not a spirit, and discarding intelligence and the cautiousness it inspires, his joyride as a rule, proves disastrous to himself and others. Next to that of the speed maniac is the career of a business man, who with God-like recklessness, abandons himself to business, and without the slightest regard for others, pursues his business, but even his joy ride, most likely shall be brief, and in the end disastrous.

This escape from the consciousness of time we achieve when we are occupied at something that interests us. To go the limit of that speed to which our organism is capable in activities for which it is adapted, gives a consciousness of deliverance. When we are retarded or forced to a standstill before our forces are spent, in short, when we have to wait, we become painfully aware of time.

God is *IT*. Neither a he nor a she—and in the soul of the ether, the masculine and the feminine elements are not equal in strength; therefore because equilibrium cannot be obtained, the strife which is life, ensues. The masculine being, the dominant factor as evidenced by the males fighting for the females.

In regard to population, the consciousness of our Heavenly Father must be somewhat like the feeling of an English poet—Lamb, I believe his name was—who, when he was walking down a crowded street, mingling with people, wept for joy because there were so many of them. The Malthusian consciousness, born of the same crowded conditions, cannot enter his mind.

As a brooding spirit moving upon the waters, the will of God is a will to be under every and all conditions, and his will to be causes all the orderly movements and all commotion in the cosmos. His creative genius is such that if he puts his attention on a speck of cosmic dust, it begins to revolve in his mind and grows into a solar system. He is self-centered, and filling boundless space in which there can be no absolute center, this characteristic creates bodies of a globular form. Necessarily the form of concentration is a frictionless medium. The organic forms on the surface of these globes as observed on the face of our earth are more or less elongated by the friction of the medium in which they move, be it earth, air or water. The eyes are the freest organs of the bodies and therefore almost round. So are seeds and eggs, being freely formed, approaching the globular forms.

How spirit can act upon matter is as yet an unsolved mystery, but evidently it does so, somewhat as a magnet upon steel, and God through his creatures, must be aware of pain and pleasure. In other words, he can feel. In the beginning of the foundation of our earth, or in the endless time it has existed, if it is eternal, the sum of his sensations, received from the earth, would, we assume, determine its position in the frictionless ether. So our earth revolves on an axis inclined towards the plane of its orbit, resulting in the changing seasons, at an angle exactly like the one which gives to earth life its maximum pleasure and its minimum pain, compatible with the greatest number and the greatest variety of sentient beings.

As there is nothing in the outer darkness to hold his attention, God must necessarily turn his face, figuratively speaking, toward the shining surfaces of the celestial globes where he sees himself reflected, this, however, is rather a revelation than a reflection. But we may imagine God as beholding his image reflected on the face of the earth and fascinated thereby to a degree that he is unable to tear himself away from it. And, if this was a myth making age, we should say that God made valleys, hill-sides and slopes on purpose to see himself reflected at different angles. But if the Supreme Being should look behind phenomena, the chances are, he would be disappointed as a cat is disappointed when it looks behind the mirror for the cat it sees in the glass and finds no cat there.

Looking now towards the earth, the first material that encounters the gaze of God is the clouds, and by his will to be the vapors of which they are composed, are immediately turned into an image of himself as far as this material permits and the snow crystals are created. Like beautiful flowers of pure water, the snow crystals that live forever in the memory of God, now comes to his mind since conditions are favorable. If God cares so much for a snow flake, could he ever forget me? In other words, could I ever forget myself? If my body turns to dust, shall I not forever be longing and looking for its reappearance, and for all I am, for all I have loved and lost, for everything that lives in my memory, for this is the contents of my memory which again is part of the perfect memory of God.

And since we exist here on earth as individuals our record in the perfect memory must be individual records, capable of being reproduced. Am I conscious of myself and under what conditions do I exist when my soul is not reflected here on earth, these are the questions, and, using again the idea that the world of phenomena is a reflection of the face of God, we observe, that my own consciousness is not immediately dependent on seeing myself reflected in a mirror. My self consciousness is rather blurred or lost by this contemplation of my image. So during the seasons we do not see ourselves reflected here on earth, our self consciousness perhaps is intensified and its activities freer and larger for all we know. Of this life only dreams gives us a faint idea.

In my memory too, lives those I have wronged and those I have hated. Perhaps I shall meet them again until the wrong is righted and the hatred appeased, and all sins forgiven. It is worth noting that it is those who died young or died unhappy that we more intensely desire to see again, as this again probably is the innate desire of the soul of the ether too. And this gives a semblance of truth to the saying: "Blessed are ye that weep now, for ye shall laugh; Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy; for behold, your reward is great in Heaven." The reward being this, that since they live more intensely in the memory of God, their chances of appearing in the flesh is greater. They gave God a pain or caused him a sorrow, and to rid himself of that unpleasant sensation, this desire puts them forth again and again until they become happy and at last shall be satisfied with days.

The immortal taking on mortality as when the vapors that rise from sea and land and reach the higher regions where they are formed into crystals, is a simple process, and in regard to the snow crystals, it is not difficult to believe, in fact, we know that if all of them should melt away, that is, become extinct, they would again

come into existence the moment the elements and the other conditions required were present. Equally simple, and equally mysterious, undoubtedly is the formation of the sunflower, for example. The memory we might say, of the sunflower, the content of its soul, slumbers in its seed, and to that extent, it is detached or made independent of the creator and the elements.

A seed falls to the ground, and in due season sprouts and struggles upward, striving to produce a flower, and when its movement for a time ceases, its soul comes to rest—it slumbers in thousands of seeds similar to the original and they again fall to the ground and its history is repeated. Should the seeds containing the record be destroyed and the species become extinct here on earth, it still may bloom on other planets, and by a reflection of these here on earth, or by some other means by a mechanism of memory unknown to us, be restored to the earth's flora.

More detached, more independent and more different from each other is the history of human souls than those of the sunflower. We have, it seems, when it comes right down to it, but one desire, and that is to be what we are, a desire that craves and must crave individual, immortal existence. How this craving can be satisfied, so far, God only knows, but by seeing him face to face or his reflection in nature, sometimes it must dawn in ourselves an understanding of this an understanding, which shall make us free.

As a spirit brooding over the waters ever in the act of becoming conscious of himself, the will of God bears down on earth with a steady push like that of gravitation, for gravitation is rather a push than a pull, and the souls on earth meet the soul of God in an endless embrace and in a creative moment of stillness, that which is contained in the memory of God, plus the memory of the experiences of earth life of the creatures therein is realized. This gives to God something new and interesting, and from this, we infer, that it pleases God to see us get out of the rut and that even our pains by him is perceived as pleasure. Innovators must be his favorites. They suffer themselves or give others pain for which they ought to be rewarded in Heaven.

To turn our attention to God and throw all our burdens on Him may be pleasing to us, but from God's point of view, it must seem better, as it must ultimately be better for us—that we should act independently and go as far as we can, experiencing all the joys and sorrows our peculiar constitution under the peculiar conditions under which we live is capable of experiencing until we sink exhausted in utter darkness far from the regions of light. Thereby the consciousness of God is extended and enriched. Devotion, on the other hand, may degenerate into a sort of parasiteism on the Godhead.

But the Godhead, itself, is an inexhaustible field of exploration and if our exploration of it does not please him, it shall probably bring him down from Olympus and that downfall shall awaken in him self consciousness, a consciousness that seems to be lacking in the Godhead. He is still on the instinctive plane here on earth. What would happen if he should gain that self consciousness and a will and an intelligent purpose, no one can tell, only we shall guess that it would be similar to what happens in the mind of a man who takes control of his thoughts, even to some extent of his dream life.

Empirical psychology throws some light on this subject. According to it, innumerable concepts are hidden in our memory. None of them are ever forgotten. They are always present in our mind, clamoring for recognition—for an opportunity to rise above the threshold of consciousness. Similarly the sum or totality of all experience is ever present in the perfect memory of God, waiting to be repeated in the physical world. Prophets looking into the future are led to believe that that in which they are interested is near at hand, which indeed it is, but its coming to pass has nothing to do with time as measured by the clock. It cannot be fixed at any point in time, for by my interest or non-interest I can hasten or retard events. Artificially, accidentally, or wantonly individuals can force things to be here on earth.

Among these concepts are the Utopian ideals—to keep to that class—and as a desire for something shall help a concept hidden in our memory to rise above the threshold of consciousness so our interest in Utopias shall bring about their realization in the realm of reality, and lift them above the dream life. Attention is the main point. Prayers, praise, condemnations, all are equally effective if equally intense. Condemnations are generally more heartfelt, and therefore most effective in fixing the attention on a given concept. Prayers as a rule are more luke warm, and therefore do not go very far, but every little bit helps. Concepts long forgotten may come to our consciousness through vivid dreams. So at present unknown Utopian ideals and the means for their introduction shall come to us when humanity is exhausted as it soon possibly shall be, or shall find itself in a state of a coma. Then those who are not exhausted and are awake to the possibilities of Utopias shall perhaps be able to lay the foundation in many places for ideal commonwealths that shall become dominant in a day to come.

If we praise God, that is good for ourselves, but shall hardly make any impression on him. The Jews assumed that it did; the sum and substance of the Psalms, is this: "Lord, my heart is not haughty, nor mine eyes lofty; neither do I exercise myself in great

matters, or in things too high for me." Now you ought to do something for me in return for all that praise. A praise or rather flattery of that kind cannot be agreeable to any great man, or any great God. Praise to have any value must be as from a master to his pupil, otherwise it is an impertinence. All praise when we come right down to it is self praise and as such may be pleasing to God as it is beneficial to ourselves. I praise God because he is my God, and my country, my flag, etc., in the same spirit.

This praise of symbols, living or dead, prevents to some extent the calamity, often overtaking exceptional character, of becoming the victims of praise, for while it does us good to praise others, Gods or men, to be praised ourselves must be put down as a misfortune. Often we inflict a permanent injury on our friends or loved ones by praising them. For our, in the opinion of others, necessarily excessive praise, shall create in these others an antagonism hard to overcome by the victims of our love.

To be appreciated on the other hand should be pleasing, both to God and man, and the only way we can show our appreciation of what God has done for us is that we should eat of the Tree of Life and drink of the Water of Life freely. Both the animal and vegetable Kingdom offers us an abundance of good things. Almost every family and specie furnishes us with something good to eat or wear: animals with milk and butter, insects with honey and silk, mollusca with meat and pearls, etc. God wills that we should satisfy our appetites to the full extent including our hunger and thirst for righteousness, that is our own righteousness, likewise our craving for freedom.

Freedom implies that we rise above our appetites and passions. At least we must be fairly able to control them. To try to suppress them shows weakness and is wholly unnecessary and often fatal to our good health and spirit.

And civilization is an attempt to rise above the instinctive life and put it under wise control. So far this attempt has proved to be an Upastree. But by extracting from it every form of slavery its poisons at the same time shall have been extracted and the fruit of intelligent life, civilization, shall be sweet and savory like the fruits of the instinctive life. These two modes of existence are distinct from one another. We have no right to ascribe to animals the sentiments of intelligent beings. Animals, though they fight with blood on tooth and claw, are not cruel for they know not what they are doing, and they are innocent and happy for the same reason. We, as intelligent beings, *know*, therefore we cannot prey upon one another with impunity.

To pray puts us in touch with the instinctive life. It does not lift us above it. Our upright position has to some extent separated us from that life and in a way put us in opposition to it. Kneeling when performing the act of praying is therefore a natural inclination toward a more direct line with the creative will. And in agony, which we take to be a consciousness of being lost or separated from God—men will throw themselves on the ground instinctively seeking in this position to facilitate a reunion. So we observe that a child being raging mad will throw itself on the floor and kick and scream. When after a spasm of that kind we find mother and child in a fond embrace as is generally the case, we almost suspect that the whole scene was only indulged in, to intensify the consciousness of love. Something like this is probably the nature of most quarrels between lovers and between married people. Cultured people control their angry passions and probably at the same time kill their capacity for love. Speaking of anger the prophets of Israel come to our mind. In their wrath they tore their garments to pieces, but in them, too, we notice a transition from this intense anger into a mood of the most tender love expressed with the most tender words.

Under all this God himself is not angry. All anger is caused by the contrariness of things and the contrariness of men and the armies of men, and this anger only intensifies the consciousness of God and his will to be.

We always get what we pray for, or that which we most intensely love or fear and consequently pay most attention to. If we sometimes don't get what we pray for or something else it only proves that we did not know what we wanted. Once I walked under the starry vaults of heaven with a beautiful young girl beside me, indulging as usual in a rather Utopian dream. Then a shooting star shot across the sky leaving a vanishing white streak in the dark blue, and the girl cried out: "Money, money, money". When I asked her the reason why she told me that if we can name three wishes during the brief passage of a meteor through the earth's atmosphere, these wishes shall come true, and as an occurrence of that kind does not give us time to think, she had formulated her three wishes before hand. What I admired most in that girl was her good common sense, but I suspect that money was not her main desire. She is married now, I have heard, to another.

OUR POLICIES

The will to know leads to Nirvana, and the will, or rather the ability to feel, leads to death on the cross, in both cases, I shall lose the pearl of great price. But the will to do leads to everlasting life.

The will to do, to construct or destroy, in short, genius, is most general, most in evidence just before the age of puberty. We are then filled with a surplus energy that craves an outlet. After that our genius is often drowned or lost in the storm and stress of passions. As we grow older, we get smart, we get wise, or we are dulled in the treadmills of industry, commerce and professions. Only in rare instances is our original genius, retained or regained, if lost.

Genius is at one with the creative will of the universe. It continues the instinctive process of creation on the intellectual plan called *civilization*, which is the work of genius. What genius has created, genius can destroy. It created the institution of slavery for instance, and only genius can do away with it. A genius works of himself, by himself and for himself. He needs no other incentive to action. I write for my own edification and create for myself a community where I should like to be. Building for myself and preparing for myself a way that shall give continuity to my work if not to my consciousness. In this I shall be in perfect accord with the instinctive life. Each specie and each specimen within it seeks its own welfare singly or in a mass, and the result is a world teeming with an endless variety of beautiful forms. If I plant an apple orchard, I do it for myself, and I tend to my trees for my own benefit. This does not exclude that I care for or even love my trees, but I need not play the hypocrite and say that my work is for their sake, and the trees do not and need not feel themselves under an endless obligation to me for my tender care of them. They simply thrive. In the springtime they bloom and during the summer they bring forth fruit. And in the fall when I gather the apples from the loaded branches, I do not rob the tree, I believe it of a burden, so a genius gives of his abundance, and whosoever will, can take of it freely.

Genius creates and is sustained by the new. If we, like the animals, had no memory, we could go on doing the same thing over and over again without being tired. Perhaps we grow old and die simply because we cannot create anything new and cannot bear to see the same story repeated everlastinglly. It is memory which prevents us from enjoying a movie picture twice. Its newness is gone and we cannot feed on it. It is already digested. A drama bears repetition better because sometimes there is more substance to it than we could assimilate by witnessing one performance only.

Given an idea, a genius proceeds arbitrarily and selects the material needed for his creations in the same way, be that material clay or communities. But the result of his effort shall be

determined by the greatness of his genius and the character of his material, and likewise by previous efforts by himself or others in his chosen field. While previous efforts may help him, they may also hinder him and naturally they make it harder for him to create anything new.

The direction of the creative will must to some extent be determined by the needs of the times. Now there is a call for utopias, and while utopianism is as old as human society, this field is by no means exhausted. The foundation for ideal commonwealths offered by the republic makes it practically a new field, and the revival of many ancient arts within that field and the opportunities offered for those who are not immediately interested in utopias, should give to this idea a general appeal.

Utopianism as a fine art, a social art, including all the others and dependent on free institutions, requires that the preservation of the republic must be the first consideration for those interested in this field of endeavor. Its basic idea that government receives its just power from the consent of the governed is something new, something unique and superior to older forms of government, nearly all of which derived their power from God or Gods. God is not in our constitution. God is in me who together with my equals wrote the constitution. So radical was this revolution that few realize even today what changes in our social order it must bring about if we build on that foundation. Perhaps it shall take us thousands of years before we are fully readjusted to this that God is not in our constitution, and that idolatry of any kind is foreign to it. But the priesthoods know. And they are seeking and must be seeking to make out of the republic an idol behind which they, clothed in authority like a power behind the throne, can have dominion over people. Either this or they must try to put their old tribal God and obedience to him, that is to them, above loyalty to the republic. Since God is not in the constitution, we are morally free, and since the government derives its power from us they are not our rulers, but our servants. And being morally and politically free, we are also economically free. We can own, acquire and dispose of property. Our liberty is only limited to the extent that it does not interfere with the equal liberty of others. This we have heard many times and said it before, but the majority of people care not for freedom any more. Like good health we take freedom for granted so long as we have it and often lose it through carelessness on that account.

Ideals attained cease to be moving or dynamic, they become static and permanent. So our republic has become static and

permanent and freedom a fixed condition, and its routine business should be given to woman, who would be better able to take care of it as a permanent home and better able to infuse life and beauty into the functions of the state in its finished and pure form.

What shall we do under condition of freedom? That is the question both for man and woman. When woman more generally overtakes the routine business both in public and private life, then that question shall become more acute.

We cannot forever stand pat. Safety first is not a sound doctrine either. We shall never be able to lure the Weltgeist over on our side with that sort of sentiment. Be sure you are right and then go ahead. That's more like it. And if you at first don't succeed, try, try again. That's the spirit. To Hell with safety! That sounds better, anyway.

Without policies or more or less clearly defined national aims or aspirations, the ghosts of foreign gods shall get us. Let us, therefore, to begin with, give an old formula, how to kill a ghost: When you have your ghost located, get your gun; then turn your back to the ghost and aim exactly in the opposite direction, then fire away and the ghost is gone. This formula for killing ghosts my elders gave me in my boyhood's days and I thought at that time that this was the height of absurdity. Now I know better. It is the opposition to them that keeps most ghosts alive. Turn your back to them, aim at something else, or be absorbed in some other pursuits, and they die. Indifference kills everything, among other things free institutions and utopias.

The majority shall never care for any discussion on utopias. To the simplest proposition of that kind they shall say with a self-satisfied smile: "This is too deep for me!" And what spiritual haughtiness is not hidden behind that smile and that saying. From this, however, we shall not conclude that the masses care nothing for an ideal commonwealth, only that they care nothing for theories about them. They want a demonstration. Action. The masses like music and plays and care but little for the performers and nothing at all for the science of harmony or dramatizing, and so it shall be in regard to utopias.

To educate the masses is the business of the republic, and not ours as utopians, unless it should be that we shall furnish material for study in our special branch of endeavor.

To create utopias to the extent that it is possible within the frame of the republic must be considered a private affair, undertaken at the initiative of individuals interested. And our chances

of succeeding shall probably be greater if we do not take outsiders into our confidence and do not allow those who are not interested to meddle with our affairs.

An artist inspired with an idea which he wants to realize will devote his whole life and sacrifice everything for that idea. So the creator of utopias must be imbued with the same spirit. Not presenting themselves as a living sacrifice, but embracing utopianism as a golden opportunity for self realization.

This narrow way leading into a new life shall try men's souls. Many shall have to leave everything behind, and everything does not here mean so much our material possessions or necessarily these; more often it shall mean father, mother, family, friends, etc.

Freed from the bonds of affection to the extent that they shall not interfere with his will to be what he wants to be and having overcome the pressure of doubt created by intelligence a creator of utopias is at one with the creative will of God, the will to be. Now the creative forces in him and through him on the intelligent or human plan outweighs or overbalances the will to be on the instinctive plan. God's creative will is with him; in other words, the forces of the instinctive life welleth up in him to an everlasting life. Our God on the intelligent plan is glorified in him. But only when a social unit is created where the social will or public opinion is in harmony with his own will or opinions shall his victory be complete.

The utopian movement shall be similar to that which took place when aquatic life sought or was forced to seek a life terrestrial. They who had outgrown to some extent the life in the sea, like the amphibians, or to whom that life had become intolerable, were the first to venture upon dry land and adapt themselves to a new heaven and a new earth. It was not a mass movement, nor did they who started on their perilous journey previously try to convert others by agitating the sea. Rather, we imagine, did they steal away in the night, quietly, when protected by darkness, wary and well aware how poorly they were equipped to cope with the new conditions. Utopians in the same way shall proceed with the utmost caution, and like birds hiding their nests in the foliage of trees and the shrubbery, or building them in inaccessible places. Thus it shall be until they have grown wings and are better able to take care of themselves.

Once utopias are safely and firmly established the masses must inevitably follow the pioneers as the line of least resistance. Converted or not converted, willingly or reluctantly or fighting against it, that shall make no difference. They are then bound to

be lifted up. If we bear in mind that earth life is a striving upward all that is needed is an outlet on a higher level of existence.

The moment an ideal commonwealth has been created this outlet on a higher plane exists and shall exert the same power and fill the same function as that of a siphon. Only this shall be an inverted siphon. And, as we cannot forever resist a natural law all must at last be swallowed up by this inverted siphon. One siphon having an outlet on a lower level would in time empty the ocean, and one utopia or inverted siphon would in time draw up the masses, and when we shall have thousands of them going there is no escape.

To those who are most perfectly adapted to the aquatic life and are successfully established there, and therefore have no great longing for the life on land and prefer water to air, the disappearance of the sea, or present civilization, shall be felt as a going down to hell and destruction of all that they are, of all that they have and all that they love. Only after they have emerged from the upper end of these bent tubes or siphons shall they be able to realize that they have been lifted up to heaven via hell, the customary route, by the way. The small fry, having little or no power of resistance, shall, of course, be the first to succumb to the suction of the siphons, and their passage through these test-tubes shall be, comparatively speaking, easy. For the bigger fish the passage shall necessarily be more painful, and for those with swollen fortunes almost impossible. They who are in the habit of saying: "This is too deep for me," shall naturally fight shy of the siphons so long as they can, and when the water begins to be too shallow even for them they shall continue to resist. But in spite of this, and still saying "this is too deep for me," they shall go down to hell and at last be sucked up to the heavens and saved.

"And there was no more sea."

RESURRECTION OF THE GODS

As there is a resurrection of the flesh in the physical world there ought to be a resurrection of the gods in the spiritual world, and in consequence thereof, artistic creations of gods as symbols of spiritual realities. Our national flag is such a symbol of a spiritual reality, namely our national unity in regard to fundamental principles. Other symbols may to our advantage be created and without danger if we only bear in mind that they are only symbols and not idols.

Since the national flag symbolizes the national ideals and in a measure shall help to keep them alive in our hearts, a more strict etiquette in the use of the flag should be observed. This stricter observance shall require more attention to it, and consequently we shall think more of it. It is no small matter.

By respecting the flag of other nations, we honor our own so what we shall say of our own flag should be applied to those of other nations. That it should not be used for advertising purposes is generally admitted. It should be clean, its colors bright, and it should not be torn or ragged, and preferably carried aloft on a staff or hoisted on a pole. Moved by the wind that bloweth where it listeth it takes on an air of spirituality that refuses to take on a fixed form, and is therefore a fitting symbol for the idea of freedom. Nailed to a wall or in a similar way used for decorating purposes, it loses this semblance of spirituality. The good old custom that it should be raised at sunrise and lowered at sunset should be scrupulously observed. It signifies that it is a symbol of enlightenment and intelligence above the dark ages of instinctive life.

The use of the flag should always have a meaning. If we see it floating over a court house it should be a sign that court was set; if over a schoolhouse, that school was on, etc. Flagging should be used with discretion. General flagging on national or local holidays for that locality adds greatly in the creation of a festive spirit. Used all the time, it loses that effect. It should, therefore, be used on special occasions only. That the flag is raised to the top in memory of great men or great events is good, and that it is lowered on half mast when one of national or local prominence passes away, is a beautiful custom. Here, however, something seems to be lacking. Why should great men be honored only when they are dead? The Roman senate sometimes voted a triumphant entrance into Rome as a recognition of the victories of great generals. Could not our senators vote a flag day in the honor of some man or woman who had rendered a great service to the nation and deserved a recognition of that kind? On that day the flags on all public buildings would be raised and by the general public it should be displayed to the extent the citizens agreed, with the senator's decision. In Rome, where all power was centralized, a triumphant entrance was the proper thing, but in a republic where the reverse of this is the social order a flag day should be the more fitting form, and just as effective, and, in some respects ,this visible though silent tribute would be more beautiful.

To compel anyone to salute the flag or kiss the flag savors of idolatry, and it is against its spirit. It reminds us of the story of Gessler, the Austrian tax collector, who in Switzerland, put his hat up on the top of a pole and compelled the peasants to salute it, against which the peasants, naturally, rebelled.

To salute the flag, if it is voluntarily, or better still, if it is involuntarily done, is a beautiful tribute to the national spirit which the flag symbolizes. But one whose heart is not stirred to that extent when he sees the flag of his country unfurled should be pitied for his emotional poverty, rather than punished.

Nationalism, if purged of all imperialistic tendencies, is probably essential to free institutions and a state is needed as a higher court above the social units of which it is composed, and in each of which the imperialistic tendency to rob and crush its neighbor, is inherent. It is also useful as a means to transact international business.

A republic founded on reason must recognize the equal rights of nations as it recognizes the equal rights of individuals within its jurisdiction, and to the extent that other nations adopt this principle, the extent to which we shall be able to live up to our ideals, must in a great measure depend.

There is a long way before we reach ideal nationalism. Commercialism has to a great extent broken the national barriers and absolute free trade and the facilities for travel and the freedom to go from one country to another shall in time create a better understanding between people of different nationalities. At present, all nations, big and small, including our own, are tainted with imperialism, and it is this idea that causes most of the frictions. We need not go far before we become conscious of this. I enter a saloon and join a group of Englishmen. They are a jolly and genial bunch of fellows, witty and fond of telling good stories. Then one of them becomes serious, and speaks of righteousness, and at once we are chilled, for their righteousness is not our righteousness, and we notice that one who boasts of his own or his country's righteousness, never laughs. He feels offended at a faint smile on our part when he speaks righteousness. It is instinctive, therefore imperialistic and way below the intelligent plan.

And when we see an Englishman make a big mouth and speak about an Englishman's blood, that gives to his face a peculiar ape-like expression that is very repulsive. In an ugly mood we ask: "Is there anything especially sacred about an Englishman's blood?" There are other bloods. There is the Norman blood, for instance, not to mention the American blood.

And then again, some prominent Englishmen have expressed the wish, repeated after them in the barrooms, the wish that they could make other people think like an Englishman, unable, it seems, to understand that to us, if we be not of that breed, the mere thought that we should come to think like an Englishman is revolting, and as for a possibility that we should come to look like one, when he puts out his lips and speaks of an Englishman's blood — "God of our fathers, spare us yet."

Later we are among a crowd of Germans, drinking beer, and here we meet similar conditions. To begin with, all is well, the Germans are social, interested in many things, and above all, enthusiastic. Everything is lovely, "*Leben und leben lassen*," until we come to *kultur*, then the trouble begins. They are trying to tell me that culture began with the Germans and it shall end with them, and they are serious about it with an almost righteous seriousness and expect me to listen to this with a straight face. Upon inquiry I find that they have only a rudimentary knowledge of the history of the German races, and only a faint recollection of the names of some of the famous men of Germany. They have not read the works of the philosophers of that country. The best ones they never heard of and, judging from what I hear, the only German songs they know are "*Die Schwarze kuh*" and "*Ei du Schöne Schnitzel bank*." And they put on an air of superiority and speak to us about culture, even German *kultur*. "*Ei du Schöne Schnitzel bank*." That's all I can say.

After this I decide to go to a movie theater, and as luck has it, I am to witness a war play, and the scene is laid somewhere in France. To look at the pictures, the more exciting the better, fixes the attention on the externals and calms our spirit. The hero of the play at last dies for his country, unknown and unrecognized, and dying, he is made to say, "It is glory enough to be French." Somehow this moderation in the expression of the patriotic sentiment, takes away from it everything that is offensive. Men of other nationalities, are not belittled, or made to feel inferior. On the contrary, others can to some extent share in the glory of the French hero, which is as it should be. For Germans, too, and men of other nations, have died for their country. "It is glory enough to be French."

National glorification or bragging, like bragging of our family, or of ourself, is natural. It acts as a suggestion, in fact it is a kind of auto-suggestion. It stimulates and strengthens us and is, therefore, a good thing. For many a necessity which we would not take away from them, as we could not think of depriving a cripple of his crutches. But our aim should be to

make it the least offensive to others without diminishing its benefits to ourself. Auto-suggestion, for example, can be most effectively applied after we have gone to bed, just before we go to sleep, and it shall not then disturb the sleep of anybody else. Likewise, the family brag should be indulged in after the guests have departed. Gathered around the fireplace, the glorification of our own ancestors shall serve as a bracer after we, perhaps, feel a little depressed by having had to listen to something of that sort from the dear departed ones. The national bragging is more difficult to handle. There is a way, however. The way of Esparanto, or some other auxiliary or universal language. If we all knew a language of that sort and it was good form to use the native tongue only when we wanted to praise our own country to a degree agreeable to ourselves, but offensive to others, all would be well.

The glorification of our own, be it our family or our country, can be easily overdone. Too much is too much. At times we feel it would be a good thing to get away from it. All races have produced men who rose above nationality, and became men of the world, and whose work became the common heritage of the world, and when nationalism becomes too hot and heavy among our acquaintances, we feel a longing for companionship of men of a more cosmopolitan mind. A longing for the clearer, the colder, the more bracing atmosphere of the universal spirit. "As the heart panteth for the water brooks, so longeth my soul for Thee, O, God."

MY EMPIRE

As an Esparanto—translated, one that hopes—let us now, in our imagination, enter into this supernational world. The empire of the individual, my empire. Speaking Esparanto, I can now go to every place on this globe and meet people of any race and nationality and talk with them. The barriers of language are broken. They understand me, and I them. And much shall then be cleared that now is hidden. We shall work or play together during the day and at sunset I shall listen to their native lays, or we shall sing together new songs in Esparanto. In the twilight we shall sit and talk it, perhaps until it is night, for we have many things to tell each other, things we did not know before, now that we have been so long separated. Or I can stay at home and all kinds of people shall come and visit me. If I have an idea to give to the world, the universal language makes it accessible at once. If I make an article of merchandise, I can let it be known and people from all parts of the world

may order it. Since it is now absolutely free trade between nations, and I shall send it to them by parcel post. In short, to use the famous words of the equally famous Count of Monte Christo, "The world is mine."

But let not the vastness of my new domain make my head dizzy. I must endeavor to maintain my position as lord and master and not fall down on my knees and worship my own creation. I must strive to rise above it, and be able if need be to renounce it. Have I lost my home, my family, and lost my country, and at last shall lose my empire, stripped of everything, if my soul has not surrendered, it is glory enough to be what I am. Naked came I into this world and naked shall I go hence, and naked shall I again appear. Praised be the name of the Lord.

RETURN OF THE FATHER

No matter what the Son of Man shall do and no matter how ideal kingdoms shall be, there shall always be some reactionaires talking about the good old times and the good old god. To them we shall suggest that as the Christians during the passing dispensation had been sustained by the thought of the second coming of Christ, so they, during the coming dispensation, may console themselves with a thought of the return of the Father. This phrase has a pleasing sound, even unto us, for in our hopes he shall live and return as a god of truth and beauty, an intelligent god, having lost in his absence, all the instinctive attributes of jealousy, blood lust, revenge, etc.

Neither are we adverse to the Utopia of the reactionaries, only we hold that it must be reached gradually by the way of experiment. The demand of the absolute defeats itself, and the Utopias of the reactionaries is an absolute Utopia. Their Utopia is the original Utopia, it is paradise.

Absolute freedom is the condition there, except for one commandment.

"And God created man in his own image. And the Lord God commanded the man saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of Knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest of it, thou shalt surely die."

Now, what is the tree of knowledge? That's the question. And there can be no doubt about the answer. The Tree of Knowledge is the Family Tree. A family tree that includes all of humanity. It is *the* family tree. All the species of plants and animals are guided by instinct. They have no knowledge of

good and evil, only traces of intelligence, and there is not a single organism of life below man in which the spirit has risen to self-consciousness. Therefore of all these trees or families, man may freely eat. But all members of the human family are self-conscious and possess knowledge and should therefore be exempt.

"For in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." This is simply an injunction against cannibalism.

We do not eat the flesh or drink the blood of human beings any more. To that extent we have obeyed the commandment that we should not eat of the tree of knowledge. To most people with any refinement and whose imagination has not been dulled, or whose sensibilities have not been made coarse by early Christian training, the idea of eating of bread and the drinking of wine as symbols of human flesh and blood is repugnant, although it be called a holy sacrament.

But there are other forms of cannibalism, just as injurious or deadly to the tree of knowledge, as the actual or symbolical eating and drinking of human flesh and blood, and which shall be just as disgusting to us the moment we are lifted above these forms. Therefore, every parasite on the tree of knowledge shall perish, and every family tree that thrives on the toil of others to the detriment of others, directly or indirectly, shall be destroyed root and branch, and every empire that involves the oppression or suppression of nations shall be dissolved, and every civilization that rests upon the enslavement of the masses shall pass away.

It is the law.

And the ruins of empires and the downfall of civilizations bear witness to its truth.

Thus spake the ultimate reactionary. "And they stood up and strove against the Lamb, but the Lamb shall overcome them all."

The carnival is over with and the celebration of the carnage as a holy mass or sacrament. Ended is the sorrows of the suffering Christ the Lamb that was slain.

In Paradise then the tree of knowledge and the tree of life shall bloom and bear fruit at the same time and continually, as of Jore. And—in the garden of Eden we shall meet God! We shall walk with him and talk with him in the twilight.

Talk it over with Him now.

THE END.

BOOK III.

THE BOOK OF THE LAMB

A Brief Sketch of the History of the Judaistic
Movement from Moses to Karl Marx
Including the Story of Christ
and His Kingdom.

CHRIST AND HIS KINGDOM

FOREWORD

It comes to our mind, and we cannot close this work on Utopias without giving a short account of the greatest of all Utopian dreams: The Kingdom of Heaven on Earth.

It might be possible from the parables and from fragments of the sayings of Jesus to reconstruct and give a complete picture of that Kingdom. This, however, is not our intention: Only a brief sketch, based on what we remember of the sayings of Jesus and of the parables shall be given. What we remember is what has impressed itself on our mind some time or other. And what comes to me is my own.

As an organism assimilates only the elements that are suitable to its nature, so our characters shall determine what we absorb from the gospel or any other source. In choosing what seems right to me, I shall be just as infallible as the Pope is infallible, or Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, or anybody else is infallible.

MOSES

Christ and his kingdom is closely connected with the Jewish-Christian movement, and, in order to understand both, it shall be necessary to give a brief review of the history of that movement from Moses to Karl Marx.

"I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have no other Gods before me." These commandments were meant for Moses individually; they were not spoken to the crowd. Moses himself had outgrown all the idols of the crowd and tried to impose the God I AM on others. He had found himself and had become, as some have expressed it, a law unto himself, a new beginning, a self-rolling stone.

Like all creators, Moses wanted to create something in his own likeness, and breathe his own soul into it, and what Moses wanted to make in his own image was an ideal commonwealth. His chosen people were his own people, then reduced to a state of bondage or slavery. Of the twelve tribes, he chose his own tribe, the Levites, to rule over the rest as an hereditary priesthood. "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." This idea contains a contradiction for a holy nation needs no priest. The priest is an evidence of sin. But

because of this contradiction, a conflict arose within the organization, a conflict that vitalizes and perpetuates it through a vain effort to overcome the difficulty.

God, in the estimation of Moses, was only a means to an end, namely, to give authority to his laws and his statutes, and to give power to his precepts. This was all the more important, as he excluded the King from his Utopia.

In the first chapters of Exodus we are permitted to see the workings in the mind of Moses while he perfected his plans and considered his chances of success. He argued with God, that is with himself. In his favor was the fact that he could perform some tricks in magic. How could he speak to the people, not being an orator? His brother Aaron was good at that, and so on, and at last, he decided to try.

Meeting with the elders of Israel, he told them that the God that had spoken to him was the same God that had spoken to their fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, although he was not known to them by the name "Jehovah." "I am that I AM." At the same time he revived some of the promises that were given to their fathers concerning Canaan, a land that flows with milk and honey. And Moses succeeded in persuading them to leave Egypt and set out for the promised land.

The story about the golden calf shows that the God of Moses to the Children of Israel at that time was a foreign god, and Moses himself was considered as not one of them. "When the people saw that Moses delayed to come down out of the mountain, the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said unto him, "Up, make us gods, which shall go before us; as for this man Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what has become of him."

"And Aaron, Moses' brother, made them a golden calf, and made this proclamation, 'Tomorrow is a feast to the Lord, and they rose early on the morrow and offered burnt offerings and brought peace offerings, and the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.' Aaron explained to Moses afterwards that he wanted the people who wanted gods to give him their gold. "So they gave it to me, and I cast it in the fire, and there came out this calf." "And the Lord plagued the people because they made this calf, which Aaron made."

One of the customs of Moses was good, and we suspect it was the invention of the man Aaron, that made the golden calf. We refer to the scape goat:

"And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children

of Israel, and all their transgressions, and all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a footman into the wilderness. And the goat shall bear upon him all the iniquities unto a land not inhabited; and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness."

Could anything easier and better be invented to rid a community of iniquities when it becomes infected with the idea of sin? We need not worry about the goat. To escape from a community ruled by a priest, is salvation. For there they have that other notion too that an innocent lamb must be slain for the sins of the people.

Robert Ingersoll used to ridicule the idea of a scape goat carrying away the sins of the people, but Ingersoll, in common with most freethinkers, seemed to be unable to comprehend the usefulness of many religious customs, ignoring in this instance, that confession is good for the soul, and not only for the soul of an individual, but for the soul of a community.

The scapegoat as a prototype of the Father confessor gains an added interest. Here the Protestants are in the wrong when they assail this institution among Catholics.

Like anything else, it may be misused, but the confession of sin to a priest in honor bound to secrecy is preferable to the confessions of sins to a more or less reliable friend. And a priest, if he be the right kind of a man, should be in a position to give erring brothers and sisters some valuable advice. The best feature, however, of this practice, should be that it saves the more sympathetic members of a family or community from having tales of woe poured into their soul. For while confession is good for the confessor, it may be very injurious to the soul of a sensitive human being to receive these confessions. Their happy genius shall die thereof, and against their will, they shall be turned into suffering Christs, carrying the sins of others as a cross. And it is the happy, the generous, and the sympathetic who generally fall the prey to those who have no regular confessor and still craves to confess and needs to confess their sins in order to get relief.

Modern psychology supports the view that confessions are good. By tapping the subconscious mind, that is by drawing out the substance of injurious ideas, many are cured from hysteria and other ailments, due in the first place to suppressed ideas or desires. The older method of a scapegoat, while right in principle, was necessarily crude, but it had at least this advantage that the confessions whispered into its ears had no effect, injurious or otherwise, on the goat. What was whispered in one

ear went out the other. So we hope it is as a rule, the case with the priest. He must at last become more or less hardened. As to the psychologist, his scientific interest in the cases under his care shall counteract the evil influence of the necessarily disagreeable task of drawing out devils. This, from an Utopian point of view, is important, as the services of a psychologist shall be greatly in demand, when it comes to create ideal commonwealths. In former days it was the custom to bleed diseased bodies by the help of gently undulating leeches, sucking out the bad blood, or to use a cupping glass for that purpose. So the psychologist, by tapping the minds of bad ideas shall relieve the souls, now obsessed by various fears and hatreds, like family feuds, or national, social or religious animosities. Indeed it is an Utopian dream of dreams to have all these fears and hatreds psychologically drawn out and dissipated, and the curses changed into a beautiful song. Innocent like as the song of a child at play, unconsciously and spontaneously singing.

The men of God, or God-like men, who from time to time appear on earth, are great as long as they confine themselves to golden rules or glittering generalities. The moment they begin to prescribe rules and regulations for marriage and other matters, we see at once that the inspiration leaves them. They are not then above the ordinary legislators. Moses is no exception to this rule. His laws are human indeed, or inhuman, we should say, as measured by our standard. They contain, however, many good things that with profit could be made into our laws, and no doubt as compared with other laws in his time, they were excellent.

But the greater objection to his laws, and to any laws made by men is, that they are made permanent, and as an example of the laws of Moses, we shall quote a few verses from the Thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy:

"If there arises among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth you a sign or a wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto you saying 'Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them,' thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams.

"Thou shalt not consent unto him nor hearken unto him, neither shalt thine eye pity him; neither shalt thou spare; neither shalt thou conceal him; but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death; and afterwards the hand of all the people; and thou shalt stone him with stones until he die."

If a law like that had been in operation when Moses appeared he himself would have been stoned, for he was a dreamer of dreams, a wonder worker, giving to an old god a new name. Something of that sort a dreamer or prophet must necessarily do. Otherwise, he is a neutral or a priest living on the works of dead prophets and dreamers. The above quoted law is not on our statute books, but so long as we have the priest, we shall have the spirit of that law. Shall the prophet ever find faith when he appears? Hardly. A dreamer of dreams must be thankful if he is tolerated, and should not feel offended if he be classed with criminals.

Between the men of God and the priest, there is an enmity like that between God and the serpent. There cannot be any compromise between these two elements. But if we are not dreamers, and do not belong to the tribe of Levi, we should realize that the dreamers put a damper on the arrogance of priests, and that priests to some extent act as critics of the dreams and prophecies, purifying and standardizing the output, and that for the good of society, not one of these elements should be allowed to destroy the other utterly, as they surely would if they could.

THE PROMISED LAND

At last the Israelites were in the promised land, and it is worth noting that the rule of a priesthood proved a failure. This, however, should not necessarily be counted against the system of Moses. It was the environment. Philistines and others of the former inhabitants of Palestine, wanted their land back and made war on the Israelites. Right here the rule of priests fell through and the people demanded kings to lead them in battle.

Saul, the first one selected for that office, seems to have come nearest to being a real king, although he was anointed by a priest, and by that anointment as a king, polluted. David, the next, started well, but soon degenerated. So we find that in time of war, he sent one of his officers to the front, while he himself stayed at home and made love to that officer's wife. On other occasions, too, he deported himself unseemly. As a poet and actor, David had his good points, but as king, he was wholly contemptible.

Solomon was a genius, and he found expression for his creative energies in building a temple for Jehovah, who, it will be remembered was now the tribal God of Israel. His magnificent prayer at the dedication of that temple, bears witness to his genius. Like David, he was what they call a voluntary, and

his harem, alluded to in the Scriptures as the Daughters of Jerusalem, must have been great.

Solomon was famous for his wisdom, but can hardly be classed as a king. He was rather a shepherd. Instead of turning his energies outward and making the foreigners pay the tax required to build the temple and support his harem, he turned against his own flock and fleeced the people in true shepherd fashion.

At last the people were on the verge of revolt, and began to ask this fatal question, "What portion have we in this inheritance?" They were now in the Promised Land.

Millions of people today can easily understand this sentiment among the ancient Hebrews, when they read in the newspapers every night about the unprecedent prosperity and do not know wherewith to buy the next meal. Some day they shall ask, indeed, they are asking already: "Where is our share in the prosperity?"

"When Solomon died, the people asked his son and successor, Rehoboam, for relief, but Rehoboam gave answer saying, "My father chastised you with whips, I shall chastise you with scorpions."

Thus ended that class movement. For then it was that ten tribes left Jehovah, his priest, and his temple, the Holy City and the Daughters of Jerusalem.

These tribes are spoken of as lost. Rather should we, in view of the subsequent history of the Jews speak of them as saved. With kings and without kings, the fate of that people is not to be envied. Scattered all over the world, some of them to be sure, are wealthy, and a few of them immensely rich, but the majority of them are poor and far from the promised land.

THE PROPHETS

After reading the law against the dreamer of dreams, we no longer wonder that the Jews were in the habit of killing their prophets, and that the prophetic spirit finally left their race. The wonder is that some of them escaped. Perhaps the prophets whose words are recorded in the Bible were false prophets, and that they therefore were permitted to express their thoughts. The true prophets, we should imagine, were promptly put to death. For what is a true prophet? As said before, a dreamer of dreams must be one who wants to make everything new. Because he is a man of vision, to whom the future is revealed with

its new customs and its new ideas of God. The guardian of the old customs and the old ideas of God are not prophets,—they are priests.

That the prophets of Israel were at least partly priests is evident from the fact that they insisted on the observations of the customs of Moses and maintained that all the ills that overcame Israel were a punishment for their sins, that is for their failure to fulfill the laws. That it was anything the matter with the law and with the God who gave the law, never seems to have entered their minds.

And it is worth noting that if we believe the prophets, the Jews under the laws and institutions of Moses, including the rule of a priesthood, were not in any respect better than other tribes, physically, mentally or morally.

Only in this respect were they true prophets, that they began to prophesy about the coming of the true Christ, a glorious king that should restore Israel to its former glory. Though we are at a loss to know what period in the history of the Jews the prophets had in mind as a period of the past which they or the people should wish to see repeated. We progress in the manner of a crab or a lobster, with our tail or back foremost, always looking backward, always reading the history of the past, retreating from our own image. If we had an eye in the back of our neck, we would be better equipped and be better prepared for the days to come. As it is, we must depend on the more or less reliable prophets for a look into the future. The prophetic vision is dim to say the least, and we have no social organ for the prophets, not even schools for the cultivation of that spirit. The temples of the pagan nations made fortune telling a part of their business, and were therefore in respect to prophecies, superior to the Christian churches or the Jewish synagogues.

Personally, I like Jonah best of all the prophets. In the first place, he did not want to prophesy the destruction of Nineveh. And when the Lord forced him to do so, the people believed him. That shows he was an honest man. And when the people mended their ways and the Lord changed his mind and did not destroy the city, he did so without the slightest regard for Jonah's reputation as a prophet, and it grieved Jonah. The whole story shows that the Lord made a fool out of an honest man. My sympathies are entirely with Jonah.

The greatest of the prophets, however, was Isaiah, and the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah contains the fatal prophecy of a Messiah as a suffering Christ. Indeed the whole chapter reads

as if the prophet were repeating an already in his days, ancient myth. We need only quote one verse, "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."

THE MESSIAH

While the spirit of prophecy departed from the Jews, their hope in the Messiah grew stronger as time passed on. At last he came and was killed, and that he was put to death is the best proof that he was a true prophet. And to be sure he was a dreamer of dreams, with a new idea of God, a personal God of his own as opposed to the tribal God of Israel, and a new form of righteousness which did not insist on the conformity to the customs of Moses.

Nevertheless, in Jesus Judaism came to its bloom. This strange and lone flower of the Mosaic slave culture identified himself with the Father, his Father, and, in perfect obedience to his own and his Father's will, went his own way. In other words, Jesus had lost his moral sense according to the old code. No wonder that the respectable element thought he had the devil or that he was drunk, calling him Beelzebub and a winebibber.

In Christ the law was and is fulfilled by a life of voluntary service, not by a successful living up its letters.

The non-moral element, open minded children and simple minded people, understood him; likewise the suffering, the sorrowful, the abandoned. But the minds of the righteous were impregnable.

A state of perfect abandon seems to be the necessary condition of one who shall make everything new. And the words of Jesus, the children of his brains, if received simply and directly as they were spoken, have a quickening power even today.

The Scribes and the Pharisees as guardians of the Jewish faith were in duty bound to question everyone who claimed to be the Messiah, and there were many such, to ascertain if he were the right one, or only an impostor.

From the Gospels, we get the impression that the Scribes and the Pharisees to begin with acted friendly towards Jesus. They came to him, they invited him to their homes, they gave him a hearing; they questioned him especially in regard to the laws of Moses, as to the observance of the Sabbath and as to the marriage laws. "And the Scribes and the Pharisees brought unto him a woman taken in adultery, and when they had set her in their midst, they said unto him, 'Master, this woman was

taken in adultery, in the very act; now Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned, but what sayest thou?"

Here was a test case, clear and strong, but Jesus on this and other occasions, cleverly dodged the question, although there can be no question about Jesus' attitude toward the laws of Moses. He never attempted to fulfill the law. He broke it whenever he saw fit to do so. Personally, he had outgrown the morally-speaking "stoning age" of Moses.

This inevitable conflict between priest and prophet gives to the Gospel a great dramatic interest, and in the end, Jesus failed to establish his kingdom. Instead, his blood infused new life into the dying Judaism, and gave to the priesthood a new lease of power. Under the name of Christianity the racial bonds of that cult were broken and it became what it is in even this day—a great world religion.

Today, in spite of all its outer glory and display of activities, Christianity is dying. It is dying in the hearts of truly religious men and women, and that is death indeed. Shall it again be able to break its bonds? Will it again branch out? And how or in what way shall new life be infused into it? What is the new wine? These questions again give to the future a new dramatic interest.

According to the gospels, Jesus performed the customary miracles, stilled the storms and cured diseases by the laying on of hands and made the blind see by applying spit, etc. It is the same old miracles performed in the same old way. Of course they were needed in those days to give authority to a man's teachings. But time is changed. Instead of giving authority to his words, the miracles class him with fakirs. If I perform a miracle, I have proved to myself at least that it is possible to perform them, but it shall put no one under obligations to believe what I say unless it first is proved that miracle makers cannot lie. This old rut of miracles, any miracles, is a distressing affair. What is the use of doing anything for more sanitary conditions if people can be cured by miracles, and what is the use of talking about a more rational distribution of wealth, if you can feed a multitude with a few fishes, and say to the stones, be bread? What's the use of doing anything? Let us pray. That is all there is left for us to do. That's the distressing part of it, and of course we must not forget to give God the glory. In justice to Jesus, however, we shall quote what he himself said in regard to miracles:

"An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; but there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of the prophet

Jonas." "But the sign of the prophet Jonas,"—these words do not sound like the words of Jesus. We take them to be an addition made by the evangelist himself,—a pious fraud.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO UTOPIANS

In regard to the birthplace of Jesus, it is interesting to note what Mark Twain says about the Holy Land. "He (the Savior) spent his life and performed his miracles, preached his gospels within a compass no larger than an ordinary county in the United States."

Jesus was an illegitimate child. In this all are agreed. If his father was the Holy Ghost, as the orthodox pretend to believe, or someone else, is in itself of no interest. According to one of the fifty-two gospels out of which the four gospels were chosen, Jesus was the son of a Roman Centurion of Greek descent, by the name of Fortunam, and this seems to many to be the most plausible account given. Being half Greek would partly explain his subsequent breaking away from Judaism. But the fact that Joseph, his foster father, was not his real father had probably more effect on the formation of his gospel than any racial traits.

Such unfortunate,—or shall we say fortunate,—affairs, cannot be hidden, and we can easily imagine that his playmates taunted him with this that he did not know who his father was, and that Jesus, proud and sensitive as he must have been, answered his tormentors, "My father is in heaven." Illegitimate children and children of divorced parents can easily imagine that such may have been the case, and that the idea of God as a father took root in his consciousness is evident. For while this idea of God as a father is not absent in the old Jewish faith, in Jesus it was intensified.

It is greatly to the credit of his foster father Joseph, that although he was a righteous man, he took care of Mary and her child, when the real father, whoever he was, made himself absent. But the fact that he was righteous and most likely, in a narrow sense, perhaps created in the boy Jesus the resentment against the righteous that later on was expressed in several of his sayings. Anyone who has come in close touch with righteous characters today, righteous in a narrow sense, be it as adherent to religious, political or social creeds, for there are righteous ones in all fields, will find no difficulty in imagining an animosity towards the righteous, created in this way for they are always right, intolerably right.

Joseph must have taken some interest in his intelligent foster son. Taught him the law and the prophets and the psalms, for when Jesus followed his parents to Jerusalem (then twelve years old), he ran away from them and was found in the temple where he astonished the Scribes with his wonderful knowledge of the scriptures.

It is interesting to note that Jesus acted under the almost universal impulse in boys of this age to run away. In a race of pioneers like ours, the impulse is to go west. Among sea-faring nations, it is to go sailing. Jesus went to the temple.

Perhaps it would be well if this impulse was heeded in some way, in a way that gave the boys a freer choice of a career. Jesus no doubt was fit for the temple, and given the training and a seat of authority, he might have made some needed changes in the customs of Moses, and instilled in the minds of the multitudes a more human idea of God.

As it was, the will of his parents prevailed, and he went home with them. For eighteen long years, we hear nothing about him, and when he again appears, it was as an extreme opponent of the men he as a twelve-year-old boy, instinctively sought.

THE KINGDOM

“Seek ye the kingdom of heaven *first*.” That is the keynote of the gospel. He told them the kingdom of heaven is within you. That means that it must exist as an idea before it can be realized and to the question, “When shall it come?” he made them understand that it would come when that which is without shall be like that which is within. How otherwise could it be?

But so long as his kingdom is not on earth, it is only mockery to ask poor people to come to Jesus. Where is his kingdom? Seek ye the kingdom *first*.

If we have in mind that Christ’s sole mission was to establish the kingdom of heaven on earth, and that his teachings were meant for that kingdom and for that kingdom only, many of his sayings that seem hard and irrational appear rational and just. We must also bear in mind that he wanted to make everything new, and was consequently from the start in opposition to the established order, especially as represented by the priesthood of his day. Therefore, he spake in parables,—parables his immediate followers in many cases were unable to understand, though they were simple enough. But they had their own, or rather orthodox idea of Messiah and his kingdom, as something like the kingdom of David and Solomon and quarreled among them-

selves about who should sit next to him when the kingdom should have been established. So far as we can see, he met not a single soul with whom he could commune, or who had the slightest idea about his kingdom as he conceived it to be, or would have had the slightest interest in it, if they had understood him.

We shall now quote the parable that in our estimation gives the clearest insight into his idea of this kingdom. It must have been told toward the end of his career. A certain tone of bitterness indicates that he already knew that the kingdom of heaven on earth was not to be realized in his day, as it once seemed to have been his hope.

But to receive the gospel as Jesus gave it, we must for the moment forget his tragic death. Then we shall hear the glad tidings as the people of Galilee heard it before that event had taken place, and we shall in spite of the intervening centuries, come within the hearing of his voice.

Jesus, the Nazarene, is speaking:—

“The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king which made a marriage for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding, but they would not come. But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise, and another one said, ‘I have married a wife, and therefore I cannot come.’ ‘Then,’ said he to his servants, ‘The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. Go ye, therefore, into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage.’ So these servants went into the highways and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good, and the wedding was furnished with guests.

“And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on the wedding garment, and he saith unto him ‘How comest thou in, not having the wedding garment?’ and he was speechless. Then said the King to his servants, Bind him hand and foot and take him away and cast him into outer darkness. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

After Jesus had told this parable, the gospel goes on to say “Then went the Pharisees and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk. For they thought he meant them. He did. And there went a great multitude with him and he turned and said unto them, ‘If any man come unto me and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, and yea, his life also, he cannot be my disciple.’

"For which of you, intending to build a city, sitteth not down first and counteth the cost, whether he has sufficient to finish it; lest haply after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, 'This man began to build and was not able to finish.'"

The tone of this parable is not meek and humble. It is rather harsh and haughty, there is nothing in it to indicate that Jesus was a gentle dreamer or a visionary. Rather, He speaks here as a rational and practical man who knows what he wants and knows what is required to carry out his plan. That he did not find the material needed in his day, does not necessarily mean that his kingdom of heaven on earth is an impossibility. As one out of many Utopias, it might in our time be easily established, always provided that we have the material.

And the material to whom his kingdom shall appeal must necessarily be those whom he supposed it to be—a gathering of outcasts.

What possible attraction can his kingdom or any Utopia have for a business man and farmer? Or for the newly-wed? None, whatever, for the first impression we get of the kingdom in this parable is that the only institution on earth of which we have a knowledge that in any way resembles this kingdom is the poorhouse, and when we ask who shall pay for the supper, we gather from the gospels that Jesus expected it to be supported by alms. Again we see the resemblance to the poorhouse. The poorhouse, by the way has been slighted by sociologists and reformers generally—no one seems to have a good word for it. It is like the stone which the builders rejected.

Jesus himself was a poor man. "And it came to pass as they went in the way, a certain man said unto him, 'Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.' And Jesus said unto him, 'Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head'. And his sympathy with the poor led him to tell the parable about the rich man and Lazarus. The rich man goes to hell because he is rich and Lazarus goes to heaven because he is poor. "But Abraham said unto him, 'Son, remember that thou in your life time receivest the good things, and Lazarus likewise evil things. Now he is comforted and you are in torment.'" This may satisfy a primitive sense of justice, and judging a man's worth according to his wealth is still the fashion. For if we put riches or poverty as the chief virtue, it amounts to the same thing. The dollar is the standard by which we are measured, and the possession or the non-possession of it shall decide our fate. Surely most men

would hesitate to call that judgment just. But Jesus knew the need of the human heart. So he held out to the poor this hope,—that some time they should sit in heaven and see the rich in hell. It is said that common people heard him gladly. This we can readily understand. But hath not this salt lost its savor?

His kingdom was not the co-operative commonwealth, proposed by socialists, neither was it communionistic, for communism recognizes ownership,—in common. His followers should own nothing at all, but give all that they had to the poor. "And if anyone ask for your coat, give him your cloak also." Therefore it is impossible for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven, not because of any personal qualities of the rich man. Even if he was a *bad* man, that should not prevent a rich man from entering the kingdom. Both good and bad were invited and came to that supper. Nor have we any grounds to believe that Jesus had any ill feeling towards the rich. He looked at the son of the rich man and loved him. And that boy went away sorrowfully. Not because Jesus drew him away, but because, as the gospel had it, "he had much property." In the same spirit, the Scribe or Pharisee that came to the wedding feast was cast out. Earlier, we shall assume, he had said, "He that cometh to me I shall in no wise cast out," but he had now come to the conclusion that no compromise with that class was possible. There can be no room for the priest in his kingdom. Not that the priest is bad, but of another spirit.

And further, "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brother and sister, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."

This indeed was a hard saying, and many of his followers turned back when he said that.

And he promised those who shall leave father, mother, etc., for his sake, shall be greatly rewarded in heaven. The meaning is plain enough. In his kingdom, the family relations cannot be recognized. Not necessarily because he hated his relatives, but because his idea of an Utopia excluded the idea of the family like the idea of non-ownership necessarily must exclude the rich man until he has given all his wealth to the poor and is rich no more. As his kingdom excluded the family, he consequently repudiated marriage, on which it is founded. "The children of this world marry and are given in marriage, but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven." And to this on the same occasion, he added, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." And

when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine.

If this doctrine had been in conformity with the Jewish doctrine of marriage, which is essentially the same as that of Christians of this world, the multitude would not have been astonished. And another evidence that his views on marriage were different from theirs, is that his enemies tempted him on this question. Pressed hard, he said in support of monogamic marriage, that it was two in the beginning, which does not necessarily mean that these two were married, for marriage like divorce, in his opinion, may have been instituted on account of the hardness of our hearts. It was of this world, not of his kingdom, where we should be as angels of heaven.

As angels in heaven! This is rather vague, since we know so little about the customs of angels and still less about the anatomy of angels. For example, he told us that children should come into heaven, but if it should be adopted, children only, or, if we as angels could have children of our own as well, we do not learn from the gospels.

In keeping with his views that there shall be no marriage in heaven was his saying that harlots should enter into his kingdom ahead of others. What else could we expect? Harlot has to our ears a beautiful foreign sound, and to get the meaning of this word, and to understand how it must have affected his hearers, we must translate it to the common word of our own language, namely prostitute or better still its Anglo-Saxon synonym.

A good insight in the kingdom we get from these words: "You know that the princes of the gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them, but it shall not be so among you, but whoever will be great among you, let him be your minister, and whoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." This seems plain enough, but in order to impress it upon their minds he had to go through the performance of washing the feet of the disciples. What a time he had with those disciples! His idea of the kingdom was evidently that it should exist as a smaller society within a larger unit. "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your father which is in heaven." Here the outsiders are not pictured as sinners or depraved, but as glorifying God.

Speaking of the kingdom, he said, "It is like a grain of mustard seed which a man took and put in his garden, and it grew and waxed a great tree, and the fowls of the air lodged in the branches of it." And again "It is like a leaven which a

woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened." These parables show that Jesus did not expect the kingdom to be established in the earth suddenly or violently but gradually like the dawning of a new day.

Many of the parables contain the idea of God going away, leaving men free to act. "A certan man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a place for the winefat, and built a tower and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country, and at the season he sent to the husbandmen a servant that he might receive from the husbandmen the fruit of the vineyard. And they caught him and beat him, and sent him away empty."

"And again he sent unto them another servant, and at him they cast stones and wounded him in the head, and sent him away shamefully handled.

"And again he sent another, and him they killed, and many others; beating some and killing others.

"Having yet therefore one son, his well-beloved, he sent him, also, last unto them, saying, they will reverence my son.

"But those husbandmen said among themselves, "This is the heir, come, let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours. And they took him and killed him, and cast him out of the vineyard.

"What therefore, shall the lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard to others."

"And have ye not read the Scriptures, the stone which the builders rejected, it became the head of the corner."

This was a challenge and the climax in the controversy between Jesus and the Jewish priesthood came when the high priest spake unto Jesus saying:

"I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ and the son of the living God?"

Jesus saith unto him, "Thou hast said. Nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven."

Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, "He hath spoken blasphemy. What further need have we of witnesses?"

Here we have Jesus' idea of God as a power that the son of man can use. For what else does it mean to sit at the right hand of power. To the high priest it meant blasphemy as it is if we imagine this power as a ruling personality. But to modern men the idea of God as a power sounds reasonable. We must know the character and the laws of this power and must conform

to it, if we shall get any benefit from it, but it is not a blind obedience to, but rather a knowledge of, the power of God that shall save us.

The religion of Jesus does away with all worshiping of God. Therefore he prophesied that a time shall come and is now that we shall worship God in spirit and in truth and God according to his idea being a power, the one thing needful is to come in contact with and to control that power. Prayer is the means towards that end. And his disciples asked of him, "Teach us how to pray." To know how to pray is all we need to know in regard to religion, and Jesus' teachings are clear on that subject.

"And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues, and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly."

"And all things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing ye shall receive."

What more can we ask?

Christians as a rule, adhere to the customs of the hypocrites in the time of Jesus.

We have not invented prayer wheels like the Buddhists, but like the heathens, we are addicted to vain repetitions of prayers. And leading Christians pray in public. At the opening of conventions, dedications of buildings and other functions, they pray. They pray for publication and they pray from notes as if they had never heard the words of Jesus.

Lately, however, many have taken heed of the teachings of Jesus in regard to prayer. The silent prayers of Christian Scientists for an example. Likewise, "the going into silence" practiced by kindred cults more or less occult. Stripped of all occultion prayer is but another name for desire. A desire that can be cultivated by meditation until it becomes so intense that it brings results.

"If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone, or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? Or if he ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion?"

Jesus on this and other occasions, tried to persuade the people that God was not so bad as he was made out to be. He must have realized that fear, especially the fear of Jehovah, was the principal causes of the insanities and diseases prevalent, and

although he failed to save the Jews from their phobia, his method from a psycho-therapeutic point of view was perfectly correct.

Jesus, the son of man, arrogated the power to forgive sin, which was in the eyes of the priest an act of blasphemy, and in a second coming of Christ, we should not be surprised if someone in his name should declare an everlasting moratorium, nor should we be surprised if the priestly class of that day should consider such a declaration blasphemous.

At present, all of our relationships, according to the spirit of our time are seen as the relationship of creditor and debtor. But there are certain things which it is impossible for a man to do and one of these things is that we cannot love our creditors.

We cannot love Jesus so long as we look upon him as a creditor, who bought us with his blood.

And our mothers, the more strongly it is insisted upon that we owe our life and much more to our mother, the more difficult it shall be for men to love their mothers. For the mother is then put in the creditor class, demanding her pound of flesh, but as we do not blame Jesus for Christianity, neither shall we blame the mother for the spirit of our time. A true mother we shall assume has no desire to put her boy under an everlasting obligation to her. But shall say to him when he is twelve years old,—“Freely have I conceived you and freely created you, and freely cared for you till this day. Now you, too, shall be free.” And the boy shall love his mother for that.

Brothers, sisters, friends, all are our creditors; we owe them so much and are under so many obligations to them, that it is a great relief at times to mingle with and to talk with strangers.

Another class of creditors are prophets and men of genius. Because many of them were maltreated in their life time, we in our time are made to feel guilty of neglecting these men to whom we owe so much. And we become prejudiced against the prophets.

Finally we shall mention social, sectarian, national and sectional creditors. Craving justice as it is called, and in reality revenge for defeats in former days and for crimes committed in former days by our ancestors against their ancestors. Surely these sins ought to be forgiven and their debt cancelled by some sort of a declaration of an everlasting moratorium.

There are in daily life, however, many debts incurred that cannot be disposed of in this manner. Some favors, of course we can never repay in money, the more the pity, but in minor

matters it is possible and desirable that we have a medium of exchange and a wage or system of some sort whereby it is possible to pay our creditors and be set free. If they forgive our debts as we forgive our debtors, that shall not help matters. We are then only heaping coals of fire upon each other's heads with the result that our hatreds are intensified.

In the life of Jesus, the truth of the old myth about men or angels rising in rebellion against the old god or gods was exemplified. Prometheus stealing the fire from heaven to help men is punished by the gods and chained to a rock. Lucifer, the son of the morning, the bringer of light, is cast into hell. Jacob wrestled with the Lord a whole night, but that able and crafty patriarch forced his adversary to give him a blessing. And he was given the name Israel, which means one who has wrestled with the Lord. Jesus, a true Israelite, wrestled with the Lord, although he himself was not aware of the fact, but imagined that he was wrestling with Scribes and Pharisees and not with the old god whose representatives they were. When we consider that the Pharisees like the priesthood of any time, represented the cultured and refined classes and that they as guardians of the old faith had to be against him, we do not wonder that Jesus went under in this unequal combat.

The prophet as a rule is rough and uncouth, like John the Baptist, who had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his meat was locust and wild honey. Only when time has softened the memory, can we conceive of the prophet as representing a higher type of man.

The inevitable encounter of prophet and priest often has a touch of the comical, as when John was baptizing in the River Jordan,—“But when he saw many of the Pharisees and the Saducees, he said unto them, ‘O, generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?’” If John, after this speech, did baptize the Pharisees and the Saducees, the gospel does not say. Perhaps he did. Anyway, he ought to have done so.

Jesus, to some extent, imitated John. At least he spoke in the same strain, when he said, “But woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you shut up the kingdom of heaven against men. For ye neither go in yourself, neither ye suffer them that are entering to go in. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell.”

Thus spake the gentle Jesus. But the Scribes knew the God of Israel better than Jesus did, and when his own God had forsaken him, he hung there nailed to a cross, and what could he

do then? It had to be. Every priest and preacher in the whole Christendom from the pope down to the rankest revivalist, is an enemy of Christ Jesus.

"Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"

CHRISTIANITY

Christianity began in Gethsemane, to which place Jesus, shortly before his death, had withdrawn with his disciples.

"Then he said unto them, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. Tarry ye here and watch with me.'

"And he went a little farther and fell on his face, and prayed saying, 'O, My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me, nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.'

"And being in agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground."

Jesus surrendered. His will was divided. Fear of God, the tribal god, entered his heart, and his own, his personal god, deserted him. If he imagined that the God of his fathers would save him in the last moment, like the God of Abraham saved Isaac from being sacrificed by his own father, he was doomed to disappointment.

After the execution, Jesus went to hell; three days later he arose from the dead and was seen by many, so the story goes; finally, forty days after the resurrection, he ascended into heaven. "A cloud received him out of their sight."

On this story of the suffering of Christ, his death and his resurrection and his ascension into the clouds from which he shall come again, Christianity is founded. But before we start our sketch on the development, of that cult, we shall dwell for a moment on the Mount of Transfiguration. Here some of the disciples saw Jesus transfigured. "His face did shine as the sun and his raiment was white as the light." And Peter said, "Lord it is good for us to be here." Not on the cross, but here on the mount of transfiguration. And on the day of ascension, Jesus was lifted up. Here he is in a position to draw men after him, even though it should be by way of the cross. And to a place where it is good to be we should expect him to return as the victorious Christ.

Jesus went to heaven alone, so we must go alone if we shall follow Jesus. It is like going alone into a strange land and prepare a place for the loved ones at home. This separation must necessarily break up families and cause suffering all around. But suppose it is the only way to a better land? And by the

way, where else should we like to meet those whom we have loved and lost awhile, unless it be on the mount of transfiguration in the dwellings of light?

The doings of the apostles in regard to the kingdom shall now be considered.

"And all that believed were together and had all things in common, and sold their possessions and goods and parted them to all men as every man had need."

"And they continued daily with one accord in the temple and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favor with all people."

An incident worth mentioning is that one Ananias and his wife Sapphira also joined this communistic community. It was required that all who did so should give up their private possessions, but these two lied about it, and were duly punished.

Having still the spirit of Christ Jesus, the apostles came in conflict with the priests. And the high priest among other things said, "Ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring the man's blood upon us." Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, "We ought to obey God rather than men, the God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree."

So far the idea that Jesus was the Lamb of God who carried the sins of the world and had to be sacrificed in order to satisfy Jehovah, is absent.

Absent is this idea also in the case of Stephen, a man prominent among the disciples, and a man full of faith of whom it is written, "They were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spoke."

Then they subpoenaed men who said, "We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God."

"And they stirred up the people and the elders and the scribes and came upon him and caught him and brought him to the council, and set up false witnesses which said, "This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law."

"For we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us."

These accusations are interesting, as they throw a light on what the immediate followers of Jesus taught. The author of the Acts speaks of these witnesses as false. But we have all reasons to believe that they were true. Stephen himself, in his

brilliant speech before the council of elders and scribes, did not deny it. He himself turned accuser, and, like Peter and the other apostles, put the blame of the death of Jesus upon them.

"Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One, of whom you have been now the betrayers and murderers."

For this apology, Stephen was stoned.

This stoning shows that the Jews up to that time of themselves and by themselves had not risen above the laws of Moses. Later the Jews in the school of adversity have learned something, and are now a most liberal and progressive people. If Palestine should be restored to them, would they, left to themselves, be able to retain these acquired characteristics? Or would they not, under the influence of the more orthodox element gradually and inevitably revert to the customs of Moses and the everlasting stoning and stoning. And to a temple service, including an everlasting sacrifice of animals, bullocks, rams, goats, sheep, lambs, turtle doves, a butchery that must have made the temple or tabernacle look more like a slaughter house than a house of prayer.

Renewing one narrative at the point where Stephen was stoned. At this point appears a man of destiny. Saul, better known as St. Paul. He proved to be the leaven of the Pharisees against which Jesus had warned the disciples. A leaven works in a mysterious way. Many, it seems even today, are unaware of the fact, that through the leaven of St. Paul's teachings, we, as Christians, become the children of the Jews, and as such, opposed to Christ Jesus. Paul, himself, was in spirit and by training, a Pharisee. He had never talked or walked with Jesus, and the parables of the kingdom do not appear to have made any impression on him. And to begin with, he persecuted the followers of Jesus. He was present when Stephen was stoned, and approved of the deed. "And Saul, yet breathing out threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord,"—got a permit from the high priest to go to Damascus and persecute them there.

On the way he was converted. Suddenly there shined around him an exceedingly bright light that stunned and blinded him, and he heard voices. Three days later in Damascus his sight was restored to him through the instrumentality of a man by the name of Ananias, who told him what to do. (This is another Ananias, there must have been many with that name in

those days.) The conversion of St. Paul was only partial. In his first letter to the Romans, he says:

"For the good that I would, I do not, but the evil which I would not, that I do. O, wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

Poor saint! He was possessed by the devil. Now to be possessed by the devil may be a man's greatest assets. It is an energizing influence. It warms the heart and keeps up the ambition, and, provided the devil is kept under perfect control, he is not necessarily, or in all cases, a power of destruction.

Paul evidently had no genius, hence this lack of control. A man with some ideas of his own is not easily converted. If he adopts another's man's ideas, it is because he recognizes these ideas as his own ideas amplified and clarified, and since they are rooted in his own experiences, this recognition, while it shall stimulate and strengthen him like a conversion, shall not make him divided against himself, or fanatical.

The tremendous activities of St. Paul were probably the activities of a tormented soul trying to flee from itself and its evil past and from the memories thereof. A leaven was working in him and he was himself a leaven, and the church that grew out of that ferment has the character of Paul. Like him, it is dominated by the power of an evil conscience, never at peace with itself, but torn by a conflict between the carnal and the spiritual mind, it seeks relief in works of charity, missionary work and in the persecution of heretics.

Already from the start there was controversy going on between the church at Jerusalem presided over by the disciples of Jesus and the churches created by St. Paul concerning Christ and matters of faith. But Paul, a politician of no mean calibre, got it in his own way by contributing money to the poor brethren in the Holy City.

St. Paul was not hampered by any real memories of the real Christ Jesus, and therefore in better position to create an ideal Christ in conformity to the prophecies of the suffering Christ of the prophet Isaiah which we shall assume St. Paul knew, trained as he was by the Pharisees.

And if his Christ is a myth or partly so, this in our opinion shall not in the least detract from his value. No one will deny the power of that myth, if a myth it be, or its truth for that matter, in a religious or poetical sense.

As the leaven of the Pharisees worked, Jesus' idea of God as one with himself, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father disappeared. Already in the fourth gospel, the deifica-

tion of Jesus as a different being from other men begins. More and more he became like Jehovah, the tribal God, and at last one with that God.

How the Jews imagined their spiritual idol to look is not clear to us. Probably it was not clear to them, and in the nature of the case perhaps cannot be, but there is a saying in the Bible that he who sees Jehovah, dies. Probably the Jews imagined their god to be so fearful that they who saw him, died from fright.

Being the creation of an oppressed people, Jehovah naturally took on the character of a huge slave driver. He never sleeps or winks,—his eye is watching us always, what an ideal overseer that is. To get that insane image out of our minds, it is well to remember the saying of one of the mystics, "God needs my eye to see himself."

St. Paul had this peculiar idea about God, that he was like a potter who makes some vessels to honor and some to dishonor, implying that we, the vessels of dishonor, if such we should happen to be, have no right to object to the place we are put, or to what stuff should be poured into us. Recently, I read in a Christian hymn-book a responsive service. It wound up with this saying quoted from the Scriptures, "There is no God like our God." Fortunately, this must be true, whichever way we take it.

There is no one like Jesus. His is the only perfect life lived. So they say, and Jesus who came to forgive sin and do away with sin is made to make sinners of us all. Like under the old dispensation, all were under condemnation, for no one could fulfill the law, so under the new, we are still under condemnation because we are not perfect as he was perfect. The priests are not now speaking of the Christ of the gospels, because he broke the laws of Moses. But they speak of Jesus after he had surrendered to the tribal God, and quote from Isaiah the words that give their ideas of Christ. "He was oppressed and he was afflicted yet he opened not his mouth. He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, he opened not his mouth."

In vain do the Christians preach that the blood that Jesus shed for our sins on the cross is all-sufficient. Their god is never satisfied. On the battle fields of Europe today men are sacrificed enmasse to the same Deity. In the trenches we have the Gethsemane and the description of the sensations of the soldiers waiting in the trenches for the attack of the enemies, tallies exactly with the gospel account of the agony of Jesus. The

soldier's first instinct is to flee. Their fingers twist, their knees tremble, and the sweat breaks out all over their bodies. And what is "Mort Homme" but another Golgotha? And if we surrender some more, the next step in our evolution is that we go to hell. Perhaps it is better so. Perhaps hell fire is the only thing that will make us immune to the priest whose sole aim is to produce a perfect slave. It has been said that there is no hell, but fear and what we fear is the unknown. And here it is that the priest gets his power,—but when we have been in hell and have explored and come to know that region, hell, where is thy victory?

During this war, however, the tribal god and all his priests have gained a victory, and after all this great outpouring of blood we shall expect a revival of faith in Jehovah. Already we have the ancient preaching that war is a punishment for our sins. We have not been obedient enough. A prudent protestant priest, proposed to his brethren that some means ought to be provided whereby the religious sentiments generated in the lousy trenches could be preserved for future use in better days to come, when men shall forget to fear God.

Verily the salt of the earth has become a poisonous gas.

We shall probably have a new or renewed sacrament to celebrate the war and impress upon the youth the gospel of obedience, repeating the old verse from Isaiah just quoted, "He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter."

"His blood be upon us and our children." So it has been and so it shall be until we have had enough of the blood of Jesus. It is really touching, this savage faith, that it is possible to acquire the virtue of an enemy by eating his heart or drinking his blood. If we have not the spirit that was in Jesus, we can at least live as maggots in "Corpus Christi."

But everything comes to an end. Not so long ago, the sermons of the men of God breathed hell fire. Damnation was on their tongues continually, even infant damnation, but thanks to the compulsory school education, the thoughts of heretics and higher men have reached the masses, and preachers dare not outrage public sentiment in this respect any more. This gives us reason to hope that if we are patient and bear with them awhile, the blood of Jesus shall be wiped out of their mouth.

Insofar as St. Paul had a social ideal, it was more like Plato's republic than the kingdom of heaven. It is a body of which we are the members and the head is Christ. Contrary to this is the kingdom of heaven, where no one has authority over us, and where we can come and go as children, and contrary also

to *our* republic, composed of free individuals. If we choose to compare a commonwealth to a human body, we, the members, should be like blood corpuscles, freely circulating through all the organs of the social body, including the head. As self-rolling stones, we would be impelled to seek the organs through which we were best fitted to function, or in case of emergency, rush to places where we were most needed. And if a social body of this kind should become overcharged with energy, some members as spermatozoon would enter into other social bodies, that might crave to be renewed or vivified, this by some sort of social copulation.

The church can never be the body of Christ Jesus, only his kingdom could be spoken of as that.

At best the church is an adulteress. Indeed, there is much in favor of a wide-spread opinion that the church is the "great whore" spoken of in the Revelation, with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication. "And the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies."

THE POWERS THAT BE

The first delicacy was served by St. Paul in his first epistle to the Romans. The thirteenth chapter of that letter begins like this:

"Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God. The powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive unto themselves damnation." And so on the whole chapter. What rulers or what powers that be could ask for any stronger endorsements and to be sure the rulers have not been slow in accepting the idea that their power is divine. An old idea by the way, which St. Paul only adopted.

This delicacy also pleased the priests as soon as they were ordained. They were then placed in the seats of authority, and finally, during the medieval ages, a rule of priesthood was established that ought to have pleased even Moses, especially their faithful obedience of the commandment to kill the dreamers of dreams.

Thus the leaven of the Pharisees worked, and worked so that conditions today are very similar to those of Judeah. Instead of the insane running wild in ruins and empty graves, we have to be sure, asylums for them, but in proportion, probably more of them. We have not many lepers but plenty of

consumptives. We are not any better off now than in the time of Jesus. But surely we cannot blame him for that, since we did not seek his kingdom first, in fact we did not seek it at all. After the appearance of St. Paul the movement was infused with an almost insane fear of God and consequently degenerated into an unseemly scramble for salvation that resulted in the so-called dark ages.

Then came the renaissance movement, which gave birth to modern art, science, invention, our industrial system and free institutions. But this movement, it seems, has spent its force, and the forces of religion are invoked in favor of the powers that be and it is therefore meet before we go farther to cast a glance at the modern state and the powers behind it so we shall be able to see where we are and where we are going.

For that purpose, we shall read Prince von Bulow's "The German Empire", and we glean from this admirably frank book the ideas of a modern state, that of many is considered ideal. It is claimed to be the best system ever invented, and we are today not in position to deny that claim. For in democracies a somewhat similar order prevails.

In the German Empire then, there is first a ruling hereditary and military class headed by an Emperor. Secondly, a priestly class including officials and professionals, and thirdly, a laboring class or the proletariat.

Now what difference is there in that state of affairs, and the state of affairs in ancient Egypt in the time of Moses, or the state of affairs in a savage tribe where a chief and medicine man rule the rest?

In principle, none whatever; only the Germans, profiting by the experience of others,—and that's not so easily done,—have elaborated and perfected the system to suit their peculiar needs.

Prince von Bulow, of course, believes that the rule by the strong will of a privileged class is the best for all concerned. He realizes that talent ought to be rewarded and that the laboring classes should be cared for, as this shall prevent the intellectuals from making common cause with the laboring classes. For this is the real danger. It was such a combination that brought about the French revolution. It is all so simple, reward the talents, and the talented are satisfied. Care for the laborers and they shall not care for the ideas of the German Social Democrats.

So far Prince von Bulow. In passing, let us say that the French revolution was in the main beneficial only to the class from which the intellectuals referred to belonged, namely, the

middle class. The laboring class was not considered. From this we should conclude that an advancement of the laboring class must be instigated by intellectuals of that class making common cause with a class still less considered politically, economically and socially, namely, woman. Further, let us here remark that the social genius of all races in their most vigorous period is to be divided into numerous kingdoms. The will to melt humanity into a waste, homogenous mass marks the beginning of decay, no matter what the central idea of the empire may be, be it a powerful dynasty, an all-embracing faith like Christianity, or an all-dominating moral system like that of China.

We shall now fix our attention on a far more interesting power than the empire, namely, the invisible government.

In the earlier stages of idolatry, people sometimes chastised their gods, and that was probably the principal reason why Moses made his god invisible and forbade the Jews to make an image of him. Something similar has taken place among men. The Emperors, the Kings, officials, and other leading men that we see or read about, are only the puppets, the image, as it were of the real powerful men whose influence or power operates and is felt everywhere while they themselves are hidden. This power is generally recognized as capitalism. In reality, it is a new revelation of God, or to express it more clearly, capitalism is the golden calf spiritualized. The laws and functions of capitalism are generally known and need not be repeated. What we want is something more tangible than spirit, and the soul of capitalism is embodied in the safe investor. Safety first is his main concern, and therefore he hides himself to begin with. He is not vain or puffed up, at least not visibly so, and is as a rule a good Christian or Jew. And he can easily afford to appear meek and humble, conscious as he is that he is right with God. Or if he be a great investor, he knows that he sits at the right hand of power.

Simple minded people are apt to imagine that the safe investor as such is simply a parasite that could be dispensed with without serious consequences. Even as a parasite, the safe investor is by no means idle. Capital is sensitive, it is said, or as we would say since capital in itself is dead, the safe investor is, and his activities are not confined to the limited field of seeking safe investments for his capital in enterprises that promise to give returns in the form of interest, rent or profit. He is necessarily interested in the increase of population or the creation of a surplus of labor on which returns largely depend. And

also in the proper education of the people. To that end, he must recognize the talents of those who work in his interests, and repress others whose views in his estimation are injurious. Likewise with institutions, the church is his first favorite, the universities is a close second. The moment they do not serve him, they instantly lose his support, as instanced now and then when an individual church or pastor deviates from the narrow path laid out by the safe investor. Secret societies are generally favored since discussion of political and religious topics are, as a rule, prohibited in the lodge rooms. Writers, both free and employed, are watched by the unseen government. Of this we shall become painfully aware the moment we write something of real value opposed to his interest.

To strengthen his power, the safe investor must seek to make as many as possible vitally interested in his investment and the best means toward that end is the life insurance companies. In them his position is most strongly fortified. Impregnable is probably the better word. He seems to have it his own way at present, but other forces are at work to undermine his position.

Socialism was an attempt to do so, and though it apparently has failed it has thrown a light upon capitalism that makes it less mysterious, less fear-inspiring, and therefore, less powerful.

Karl Marx held that it was the historical mission of the proletariat to do away with wage slavery.

Now a mission is to me and to any man something of more value than capital. Having a mission, I take the offensive, the advantage of which no strategist will deny. As a missionary, my cause is holy. Now my opponents represent the forces of evils. They are the sinners, the degenerates, the worthless, the inefficients, etc. Surely, he that does away with slavery takes away the sin of the world, for there is no sin but slavery.

But Karl Marx went farther and formulated this famous and fatal slogan, "Workingmen, Unite!" This shows that he was a middle-class philosopher. No intelligent proletarian, having the welfare of the proletariat at heart would have made such a demand. Marx saw the proletariat as a homogenous mass. Like the priest sees humanity as a mass of sinners, and a politician speaks about people as common or plain.

To a proletarian, the masses are dissolved into individuals with the most varied aims and aspirations. In fact the laboring classes on closer observation seems to be more markedly individualized than the business or professional classes, as well they may be, since they, as a rule, have had more varied experiences

and have been less under the moulding and levelling influences of schools and polite society. To the proletarian the business men and the professionals appear more standardized, and therefore more common than other people, both in their sentiments and in their manners.

Socialists, like scientists and all religionists, have little or no genius. They are all sane and conservative. Therefore they cannot abolish wage slavery but only change its form. The only way to abolish wage slavery is to work for nothing, or for something else than wages. But to work for nothing when wages may be had, why, that is insanity. And as to our mission of saving, Jesus, they would never think of that.

All conservatives are imperialists; they are scientific. Truth is the law, and it is one, but they do not know, or fail to recognize *the truth*, that living forms and social forms as living forms must change and differentiate if life in its manifestations shall not be drab and gloomy.

This striving for unity, since it is against life, often tends to dissolve an empire, for it was internal forces that disintegrated the Roman Empire and the Roman Church Empire generated within itself the forces of reformation, and would have been destroyed by them had it not been separated from the elements that represent protestantism.

A movement to abolish wage slavery through utopianism shall probably result in the salvation of the capitalistic system and the wage system on which it depends within the limits our influences shall determine and for the benefit of those to whom this system is agreeable, and for our own benefit.

Our movement is neither a political or a religious, but an aesthetic movement, and in creating new social forms, it must, like life and all true art, strive for new forms of expression. But as a striving for unity generally results in diversity, so a striving for diversity most likely shall result in a more uniform social relationship. Like the freedom to invent and use different tools or machinery generally results in the universal use of the best and most available in any branch of industry.

Offering an opportunity to take the initiative, our movement shall lift the gloom hanging over us as threatening clouds of social questions, as it is written, and it cannot too often be repeated, "Willing delivereth." On the experimental plan, we shall among other things, be delivered from the spirit of revenge or the brooding over real and imaginary wrongs.

Keeping on the surface of things, and if we should succeed in our mission, people would, perhaps, be stupefied by happiness.

This thought ought to make us hesitate. But having been through the mill, as we have been, we should be able at least to keep our wits for a millennium, and then if need be, we shall again let loose the devil for a season to brighten our consciousness and sharpen our wits. But shall we then have sense enough left to do so. The secret of it is, the stupidity resulting from happiness or from any other cause, is the very thing that unchains the devil. It works automatically.

To expect, as the socialists do, that the present mode of production developed under a keen competition for profit could successfully continue when that motive no longer exists may be scientific, but it is not reasonable to expect. When a greater degree of freedom and a greater power of our genius is obtained, we shall expect new methods of production and distribution of wealth, different and superior to the present methods as the present are superior to the ancient.

Different forces require the use of different devices if they shall be harnessed and made to do our work. For wind, we have sails; for water, wheels; for steam, engines; for electricity, motors; etc. When the present forces then, shall be subdued by or discarded for other and mightier forces, an entirely different kind of machinery shall come into existence, and mighty engines that are now deemed great and necessary, shall then fall into disuse.

Why should we continue to build pyramids when Pharoahs no longer reign?

And this is the dilemma of the capitalist class that modern machinery cannot be made and successfully operated by devout and ignorant men, and that the same intelligence that is required of the workingmen for modern methods of production, prompt them to demand the full value of the product of their labor.

This demand, granted, or obtained, shall kill capitalism, but it shall not do away with wage slavery, for the full value of the product of my labor would then be my wages. This is at least dimly perceived by wage earners. They feel that under socialism they would still be dependent upon their wages. Hence a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the masses for socialism. This apathy cannot be ascribed to a lack of knowledge of the principles of socialism. They are generally known.

As said before the only way to abolish wage slavery is to work for nothing, or for something else than wages. Working for nothing brings the creator of wealth to the front. A man and woman who wanted to do something on that condition would be welcome to any burgh. He or she would be the master of the

situation. Under any system of wages, the one who holds the pay roll is the master.

And the masses must not be confounded with the leaders and agitators in the socialistic movement. Their enthusiasm is not aroused by any prospect of getting the full value of the product of their labor, but by the fact that they have found a mission, an inspiring cause to work for and strive for, often to the detriment of their pecuniary interests. In other words, the leaders of socialism as a rule are enthusiastic workers because they work for nothing.

We can never be satisfied with wages. To do something, or get something for nothing—that's what gives us joy. We have all had the experience that it gives us greater pleasure to win a bet or receive a dividend from an investment or the profit from a successful speculation, than to receive wages for honest toil. This is by no means a sign of perversity in the human nature. On the contrary, it is evidence of our innate nobility. For the pay envelope is a badge of servitude, and it is to our credit that we receive our wages, as we do, with a sense of shame, for it shows that no matter how long we have been trained in servitude, in our innermost heart, we are free men, biding our time, waiting for our day of deliverance, as we wait for pay day, for that great day when we shall not be dependent upon wages.

People try to hide the shame of receiving wages by giving wages different names. Salary seems to be the most popular, but then we have fees, royalties, etc.

In love affairs, the shameful nature of wages is most generally recognized. Now it is natural for a man to give to the woman he loves precious gifts, or everything that he has, as it is also natural for a woman to receive everything from the man who loves her. In fact, she expects gifts, and glories in them, not so much for the intrinsic value of the articles, but because they are an evidence of his love. So there is nothing objectionable in the giving or receiving so long as love is the ruling motive on the part of men and women.

But the moment she receives wages, that is, when she charges a fee for her favors, she is a prostitute.

And so with all wages, though in lesser and different degrees. They are all wages of sin, the only sin, namely, slavery, and a mark of prostitution.

But human beings can sink to a still lower depth than prostitution, as evidenced by the men and women who live on the wages of others. That is panderism.

Shall this be the ending of the story of the Wandering Jew that he at last goes back to Egypt and finds rest and peace for his soul beside the fleshpots of that country, and take his children to the Christians with him. Everywhere, the leaven of Judaism is at work: in churches and lodge rooms; in schools and in literature; in art, etc. Is not our whole atmosphere saturated with a religion that had its origin in Egypt? How can we then, escape the condition of Egypt? A waste horde of slaves ruled by a priestly and military caste? It does not seem possible. But the end is not yet.

OUR KINGDOMS

When Aaron wanted to make an idol, all he had to do was to throw pieces of gold into the fire and it came out a golden calf. So it seems that no matter what we do, no matter what social movement we inaugurate, after it has been through the fire, it always comes out an empire, composed of a leader of worldly affairs and his followers, and a leader of a class devoted to spiritual affairs and a more or less neutral mass. Now we ought to rejoice in this as in the discovery of an important social law.

If an empire is, like the golden calf, an inevitable outcome, let us make it over to suit ourselves. And the first consideration must be that it must not grow beyond our control, and it shall in no way rule over us, but every calf is an embryo apis or an empire in the making, that has it in it to dominate and bully everybody and to stunt its growth without destroying its health and beauty is no easy task. Over in Japan, however, this is successfully done with certain trees.

Having decided on the suitable size for a Kingdom, the next is to give to the king his proper place, and that should be that of a sentinel watching over the Kingdom day and night. Birds have sentinels when they are feeding and roosting, and people who are engaged in creative work, dreamers especially, are helpless in the hands of those who prey upon the community, and the same holds good for other producers. To the extent that they become interested or absorbed in what they are doing, to that extent they are helpless, and to that extent they need a sentinel to inform them of danger, and combat the enemies.

The priestly element we can safely leave to themselves, provided they are members of our kingdoms and not affiliated with or subject to any power resident in another kingdom or empire.

The main point, however, is the size. For it is essential that if a king should betray his trust as a sentinel, that he should not

be so far away but that my hand can reach him. Vengeance is mine and revenge is sweet. For no matter how small the Kingdom is the vigilance must be kept up if we shall preserve our liberties. And anyone who in his boyhood ever chased a calf will remember how onery even a little calf can be.

Once the ordained ones entertained the preposterous thought that they could dictate to me and other people what we should believe or not believe, but this peculiar phase of autocratic impudence is now a thing of the past, but the powers that be in our Republic have we elected, and they are just as good or better, and just as efficient as those ordained by God. And there is no good reason why our genius should not be able to create kingdoms just as good and better than any kingdom ever made.

The greatest obstacle is class consciousness. Class consciousness is the chain that binds. It should not be cultivated, but destroyed by individual efforts, that shall prove that there is nothing in heaven or in earth to which I may not aspire and nothing I may not attain, regardless of class. Among free men I need no other authority but what my personality and my words carry. If I speak like a fool my fellowmen shall know it and perhaps enjoy it. If I say something good others may profit by it, and if I am mistaken in what I say, I have given my fellowmen an opportunity to correct me. No matter how fantastic my views on social and religious questions may be, my expressing them is a good deed, for I am not indifferent. Indifference is deadly, more especially to free institutions.

What elements in our present day have we that are free from class consciousness and free from the faith in authority ordained by God, and being free from the old are also free to create something new? Perhaps the material should mainly consist in the same elements that made up the supper party in the parable previously quoted. But these poor, good and bad, as well as the suffering Christ, whom we have made it our object to save or transform, cannot save themselves. Although they can and do save others. Many make a living out of the poor and others make money out of the crucified Savior. The problem, in many cases, would be to make an institution like a poor house absolutely independent and self-supporting. But in order to make it so, it seems that its personnel had to be extended so as to include the objects of the so-called higher charities, that is, scientists, artists, inventors, etc., in other words a merging of Christ's kingdom composed of the poor in spirit, with Nietzsche's Zarathustra Kingdom, composed of the rich in spirit.

Add to these a king after their own heart and, to use a common expression, we would have a combination hard to beat.

An Utopia composed of only one kind of people would necessarily be a monotonous affair, and composed of intellectuals, as the Zarathustra Kingdom, or Brook's Farm, it is wrong in principle. Intellectuals are the salt of the earth and salt should not be found in lumps, but permeate the whole dough. A few grains in each community is sufficient to keep it fresh. And what is said about the salt holds good for ferments and other ingredients that may be needed in order to give to the bread of life an agreeable flavor.

These elements are not closely attached to present customs or ways, neither are they, as a rule, occupied in that unseemly scramble for salvation or wealth. We, therefore, consider them the best available material existing for social experiments, even as an attempt to introduce Christ's kingdom.

But would not those who live on the poor produced by the customs of Moses and other customs use all their powers to prevent the introduction into modern society of the customs of Jesus or any other customs tending to abolish the need of charity.

Remember the reckless man who introduced the umbrellas, a Chinese invention, into Western Europe. He was mobbed. What would not happen to him who would introduce a "heaven on earth" into a still more western world?

"Behold, I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves!"

SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

In the day of judgment, "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, 'Come ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundations of the world, for I was hungered and ye gave me meat, and I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; in prison and ye came unto me.'

"Then shall the righteous answer him, saying: "When saw I ye hungered and fed thee? Or thirsty and gave thee drink? When saw we thee, a stranger, and took thee in? Or naked and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick or in prison and came unto thee?"

"And the king shall answer and say unto them, 'Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me'."

These are necessarily the words of the suffering Christ, although we may doubt that they are the words of the historical

Jesus. But the suffering Christ asks nothing and can ask nothing but this: "What have ye done to the least of my brethren?"

They, that never knew him nor that had never even heard of him and presumably had not been baptised in his name, and never partaken of the holy communion, were astonished. But since they had tried to do away with suffering, they were the righteous in his eyes.

The righteousness of those who had cried "Lord, Lord," shall not count on the judgment day. Nothing is asked about faith in God or the salvation by grace, or the blood of Jesus. Nothing about the means of grace or the sin against the Holy Ghost. For all these things are the inventions and the fabrications of the enemies of the suffering Christ.

The transfiguration of the suffering into a joyous Christ or his second coming, depends on ourselves. We must work while we wait. The Jews waited for him instead of preparing for his coming, and are still waiting. The Seven Day Adventists, and the Millennial Dawners are waiting for him this present day, studying the prophecies all the time, forgetting that Christ waits for us, and they shall, therefore, most likely be the last to become conscious of his second coming. If we confine ourselves to the Bible, neglecting the world's great literatures, how can we know the signs of the times?

Other Christians secretly dread the second coming of Christ as well they may. Their instinct is true, but their ideas of that event, if they have any, are fantastic.

Take the church as a whole, that is Catholics and Protestants, together, there is not so much difference between them. St. Paul is their apostle, and let us say that she is the great whore spoken of in the revelation. Then each individual church must be a little harlot, and the question is: Will they, on Christ's second coming, like a repentant Magdalene, anoint the feet of the Savior? The world at large knows the gospel of Jesus, both as found in the Bible and as adulterated by St. Paul and the church after him. It is no use to preach any more. The world wants a demonstration of the teaching of Jesus. We have had enough of the cross. Now for the crown. And, remember, no kingdom, no crown.

Many things should favor the idea that the churches should take the lead in the Utopian field. Is it not written that harlots should go before others into the kingdom of heaven? Although we have no reason to believe that Jesus had the churches in mind when he made that prophecy, it is nevertheless a beautiful fancy so to consider it providing the churches would follow it up by a fulfillment fitting the prophecy. And many prophecies and their

alleged fulfillments are equally far-fetched. That indeed would be beautiful consummation of the Judaistic movement including Christianity.

Nothing seems simpler. In each church, or in many of them a priest or a pastor that could be transfigured into a leader or a king with a nucleus of followers sufficient to form a kingdom might be found. And all that they would have to do, to begin with, would be to sever their connections with their respective denominations, and as independent units, recognize the republic as the larger political body by paying taxes on their property. Then they are free to make their social experiments on an equal basis with other Utopians. "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's."

Will the Christians now be converted? Or shall it be said about them what Jesus said about the Scribes and the Pharisees in his day: "They neither enter the kingdom of heaven themselves, but prevent others from doing so."

Today as then, the marriage question may prove to be the stumbling block. Church people are so used to marriage in its present form that even those who derive no benefits from it or even suffer from it shall probably do all in their power to prevent any change in it. And we know, on the other hand, that unless we assume the right to change our marriage customs according to our needs, although we do not intend to go to the extreme and say that there shall be no marriage, very little can be done in an Utopian way.

Science has cleared our minds, and the fear of God and the fear of hell has lost its hold on our hearts, but in matrimonial affairs the priests of all denominations have a terrible grip on humanity, and it is hardly to be expected that they should let go of that hold, which may be their last.

Perhaps we should not have emphasized this point as we have done if we did not feel sure that to the church record of being on the wrong side—in questions of astronomy, for instance—shall in time be added her record of being on the wrong side in questions of matrimony, for such questions are not settled by the authority of the church nor by popular vote, but by the spirit of life and truth.

Utopians, however, shall have their hands full trying to create ideal commonwealths, and cannot waste their time trying to convert Christians. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still."

THE MANY MANSIONS

"In my father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go to prepare a place for you, I shall come again and receive you unto myself that where I am there ye may be also."

The mind of Jesus in this instance was free from the imperialistic idea that there shall be only one fold and one shepherd. An idea that haunts all nations and all denominations and fills the world with misery, want and woe.

He did not say how many mansions. The spirit which is Christ knows no limitations, but in the seventh chapter of Revelation we read: "And I heard the number of them which were sealed, and there were sealed an hundred and forty and four thousand of all the tribes of the Children of Israel."

They were sealed in their foreheads. What that means is hard to tell. Perhaps their names were written in the Book of Life or that they were registered at the headquarters of their respective mansions. In other words, with the sealed kingdoms, not individuals, are meant. This would be more in conformity with the vision we read about in the same chapter: "And after this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands."

Here we behold Him who gave Himself as a ransom for all as one who has gained a great victory. And this thought is more agreeable to us than the idea that a mere handful shall be saved out of the clutches of Jehovah.

And this multitude which no man could number divided into an hundred and forty and four thousand mansions, kingdoms or utopias is a plant of salvation from imperialism worth considering.

The multitude at present inhabiting our earth is estimated to number something between fourteen or fifteen hundred millions. These divided into the above mentioned number of kingdoms would give to each only about ten thousand souls. Limited to that number the imperial ambition to rule the world with an iron rod, inherent in all social units, would appear and in fact be ridiculous.

Imperialism implies an expansion of territory and an increase of population that necessarily leads to war and famine. If these imperialistic tendencies are curbed the tendency to expand and grow would force us to seek upward and in this direction we shall go from glory to glory.

While a free circulation of individuals through all kingdoms and a free interchange of members shall relieve the pressure we cannot get away from this. That, when we have beaten our swords into plowshares, a pruning hook must be applied to the

Tree of Knowledge. That is, if we still want to cultivate that tree or keep humanity above the animal level.

There is no easy way to glory.

Again speaking of the great multitude: "What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?"

"And I said unto him, Sir thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of tribulation and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

There is an error here. Instead of *in* it should be *of* or *from* the blood of the Lamb. John himself seemed to have feared or anticipated something of this sort and threatened that "if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life."

Some one has blundered, some copyist or perhaps John the revelator himself. In common usage if a man says: "I wash my hands of this affair," it is understood to mean that he will not be responsible for the deed to be done. And so it was the usage in the time of Jesus: "When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude saying, I am innocent of the blood of this Just man: see ye to it."

"Then answered all the people saying; His blood be on us and our children."

It has been on us and must continue to be so until something like His kingdom is established among us. They who claim to be His followers have failed in this. And as Lady Macbeth in her dream vainly tried to wash from her hands the blood of the murdered king so Christians in the day of judgment shall try to wash from their hands the blood of the Lamb, all in vain.

When we have created a social order or a civilization that does not demand or require blood and sacrifices, then we have made our robes white or clean from the blood of the Lamb. Then Jesus is saved. Instead of being the suffering Christ he is now our King of Kings, the patron saint of all utopians.

"Laissez faire" in the utopian field! Free competition shall bring the mansions in the sky down to earth. And among them Christ and His kingdom. Some time. To begin with there shall most likely be no place for them unless it be on the strip of land reserved for the animals. So far away is he from us or we from his gospel. But he should not always be an outcast. In the United States are many counties. Let us prepare the way that sometime in one of them he shall find a habitation and a home and where we are there shall he be also.

Press of the
Co-operative Print Shop
South Bend, Ind.





